

THE PRINCETON SEMINARY BULLETIN

AN INAUGURAL ISSUE

The Seminary as Servant

Thomas W. Gillespie

The Charge to the New President

James I. McCord

The Inaugural Prayer

David B. Watermulder

For the Work of Ministry

J. Randolph Taylor

Zeal for Truth and Tolerance:

Spiritual Presuppositions of Christian Ministry

Jan Milič Lochman

VOLUME V, NUMBER 2

NEW SERIES 1984

PRINCETON THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY



Thomas W. Gillespie
President

James I. McCord
President Emeritus

BOARD OF TRUSTEES

John M. Templeton, President

David B. Watermulder, Vice-President

Robert M. Adams, Secretary

William E. Lawder, Treasurer

James F. Anderson
Clem E. Bininger
Robert W. Bohl
John H. Donelik
Peter E. B. Erdman
Rosemary H. Evans
Milton A. Galamison
Sarah B. Gambrell
Francisco O. Garcia-Treto
Helen H. Gemmill
Carl H. Geores, Jr.
Margaret L. Harmon
Alexandra G. Hawkins
C. Thomas Hilton
J. Roger Hull, Jr.
Bryant M. Kirkland

Johannes R. Krahmer
Henry Luce III
Donald C. McFerren
Earl F. Palmer
George T. Piercy
William A. Pollard
Clifford G. Pollock
William H. Scheide
Laird H. Simons, Jr.
Frederick B. Speakman
William P. Thompson
Karen L. Turner
Jeffrey R. Wampler
Samuel G. Warr
Charles Wright
Ralph M. Wyman

TRUSTEES EMERITI

Eugene C. Blake
J. Douglas Brown
John G. Buchanan
Frederick E. Christian
Allan M. Frew
John T. Galloway
Weir C. Ketler

Harry G. Kuch
Raymond I. Lindquist
John S. Linen
J. Keith Loudon
Dale W. McMillen, Jr.
James M. Tunnell, Jr.
Irving A. West

The Princeton Seminary Bulletin

VOL. V

NEW SERIES 1984

NUMBER 2

Ronald C. White, Jr., Editor

J. J. M. Roberts, Book Review Editor

CONTENTS

| | | |
|--|-----------------------------|-----|
| The Seminary as Servant | <i>Thomas W. Gillespie</i> | 87 |
| The Charge to the New President | <i>James I. McCord</i> | 96 |
| The Inaugural Prayer | <i>David B. Watermulder</i> | 98 |
| For the Work of Ministry | <i>J. Randolph Taylor</i> | 100 |
| Zeal for Truth and Tolerance: Spiritual Presuppositions of Christian Ministry | <i>Jan Milič Lochman</i> | 106 |
| Educating for the Ministry Today | <i>Karoly Toth</i> | 118 |
| Educating Ministers for the New Presbyterian Church | <i>C. Ellis Nelson</i> | 122 |
| The Concept of Order in Theology and Science | <i>Thomas F. Torrance</i> | 130 |
| Sermons | | |
| Beyond Deterrence | <i>Gibson Winter</i> | 140 |
| A Spirituality for Combat | <i>M. M. Thomas</i> | 144 |
| There Is a Point in Living | <i>Donald Macleod</i> | 148 |
| Bibliography of Publications by Members of the Faculty for 1983 | | 153 |

BOOK REVIEWS

| | | |
|---|----------------------------|-----|
| Deuteronomic History, by Terence E. Fretheim | <i>C. L. Seow</i> | 159 |
| Ezekiel 1-20, by Moshe Greenberg, and Ezekiel, by Peter C. Craigie | <i>J. J. M. Roberts</i> | 160 |
| The Elusive Presence: The Heart of Biblical Theology, by Samuel Terrien | <i>Ben C. Ollenburger</i> | 160 |
| Visionaries and their Apocalypses, by Paul D. Hanson, ed. | | 161 |
| Mark, by Lamar Williamson, Jr. | <i>Thomas W. Gillespie</i> | 163 |
| 1 & 2 Thessalonians, by F. F. Bruce | <i>Mark A. Plunkett</i> | 165 |
| Humanists and the Holy Writ; New Testament Scholars in the Renaissance, by Jerry H. Bentley | <i>Bruce M. Metzger</i> | 166 |

THE PRINCETON SEMINARY BULLETIN

| | | |
|--|---------------------------|-----|
| The Slayers of Moses: The Emergence of Rabbinic Interpretation in Modern Literary Theory, by Susan S. Handelman | <i>Roland Mushat Frye</i> | 167 |
| Karl Barth's Theology of Culture: The Freedom of Culture for the Praise of God, by Robert J. Palma | <i>Daniel L. Migliore</i> | 169 |
| The Theology of Schleiermacher: Lectures at Göttingen, by Karl Barth | <i>Mark Kline Taylor</i> | 170 |
| The Doctrine of Reprobation in the Christian Reformed Church, by Harry R. Boer | <i>Daniel De Groot</i> | 172 |
| The Power of the Powerless: The Word of Liberation for Today, by Jürgen Moltmann | <i>Thomas G. Long</i> | 175 |
| The Power of the Poor in History, by Gustavo Gutierrez | <i>Richard Shaull</i> | 176 |
| A New Age Handbook on Death & Dying, by Carol W. Parrish- Harra | <i>Brian H. Childs</i> | 177 |
| Authentic Preaching, by Arndt L. Halvorson | <i>William D. Howden</i> | 178 |
| Preaching Biblically, by Don M. Wardlaw | | 180 |

THE PRINCETON SEMINARY BULLETIN

The Bulletin is published three times annually by the Theological Seminary of the United Presbyterian Church at Princeton, New Jersey 08542.

Each issue is mailed free of charge to all alumni/ae and on exchange basis with various institutions. Back issues are not available.

Editor

Ronald C. White, Jr.


Book Review Editor

J. J. M. Roberts

All correspondence should be addressed to the Editor and accompanied by a self-addressed, stamped return envelope.

The policy of the Bulletin is to publish lectures and sermons by Princeton Seminary faculty and administration, and presentations by guests on the Seminary Campus; therefore we cannot accept unsolicited material.

Second Class postage pending at Princeton, New Jersey 08542.



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2016 with funding from
Princeton Theological Seminary Library

An Inaugural Issue

PRESIDENT THOMAS W. GILLESPIE was inaugurated as the fifth president of Princeton Theological Seminary on March 28, 1984, in a service at the Princeton University Chapel. Sensing the wide interest in all of the events surrounding the inauguration, the decision was made to stop the presses so as to include major presentations of the inaugural week in this issue of the *Bulletin*.

Inaugurations don't happen very often at Princeton Seminary. Previous presidents include: Francis Landey Patton (1902-1913); J. Ross Stevenson (1914-1936); John A. Mackay (1936-1959); and James I. McCord (1959-1983). The presidency is a twentieth century creation, but Robert E. Speer, in his charge to John A. Mackay at the 1937 inauguration, noted that the seminary "has never been since its founding in 1812 without a real and recognized head." To the formal presidents of this century Speer included three leaders of the nineteenth century: Archibald Alexander, Charles Hodge, and William Henry Green.

Presiding at the 2:30 p.m. Service of Inauguration were John M. Templeton, president of the seminary's Board of Trustees, and J. Randolph Taylor, moderator of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.). James I. McCord, the fourth president of the seminary and now chancellor of the Center of Theological Inquiry, gave the charge to the new president. David B. Watermulder, Vice President of the Board of Trustees, offered the inaugural prayer. President Gillespie responded with his inaugural address, "The Seminary as Servant."

Even blustery weather could not dampen the spirits of the friends, both of the seminary and of the Gillespies, who filled the University Chapel. Delegates from over 200 colleges, universities, and theological seminaries represented their institutions in an academic procession. Overseas delegates included representatives of the University of Basel, the University of Edinburgh, the University of Glasgow, the Presbyterian College in Seoul, and Tainan Theological Seminary in Taiwan. Ecclesiastical delegates representing churches as well as confessional and ecumenical bodies also processed.

The Inaugural Service was but the high point of a whole series of events held during inaugural week. At 9 a.m. on March 28, a service of worship was held in Miller Chapel and Moderator Taylor preached the sermon, "For the Work of Ministry." At 10:30 a.m., Jan Milič Lochman, professor of systematic theology and rector of the University of Basel, lectured on the theme, "Zeal for Truth and Tolerance: Spiritual Presuppositions of Christian Ministry."

The previous day, a special lecture was presented by Dr. Thomas F. Torrance, professor of Christian dogmatics, emeritus, of New College, Edinburgh. That evening a pre-inaugural dinner was attended by more than 300 persons. Among the guests in attendance were four members of President Gillespie's first congregation, the First Presbyterian Church of Garden Grove, California, and more than fifty members from the First Presbyterian Church of Burlingame, California, where he completed seventeen years of service in

THE PRINCETON SEMINARY BULLETIN

the summer of 1983. Bryant M. Kirkland, former President of the Board of Trustees, served as master of ceremonies for this festive occasion. Addresses were given by Karoly Toth, Bishop of the Hungarian Reformed Church, and C. Ellis Nelson, presently interim president at Austin Theological Seminary.

It is a temptation to comment on all the many threads and colors that were a part of the beautiful tapestry that was the inaugural week. Our readers may not quite be able to hear the sound of the combined Westminster and Princeton Seminary choirs, nor sense the laughter or see the smiles that bonded old friends together during these days. But all that follows is published in its completeness so that you too may remember and at the same time participate in a continuing tradition and a new beginning.

The Editor

The Seminary as Servant

by THOMAS W. GILLESPIE

DR. TEMPLETON and members of the Board, colleagues on the faculty and in the administration, fellow students and co-workers, honored guests and special friends, this address on the theme of institutional servanthood must begin with words of personal gratitude. For it is impossible to stand here today without experiencing and expressing gratitude to all of you who have made this event possible by your planning, your participation, and your presence. Our being together on this occasion is a tribute to Princeton Theological Seminary and a testimony to our appreciation of its ministry. For this I thank you.

It is also impossible not to feel and confess a deep sense of gratitude to God for the providence which has led me to this task. As C. S. Lewis described his conversion as an experience of being *Surprised by Joy*, even so would I characterize the call of God to the ministry into which I have now been properly installed. My own surprise, however, is shared by others. In a recent letter marked "Personal from an Old Friend," a woman wrote as follows:

The voice of Marie Melrose came over the line: "Marty, sit down!" I sat. "You're not gonna believe this!" she continued and I waited. It sounded like an impending disaster and I braced myself. "*Little Tommy Gillespie is the new president of Princeton Theological Seminary!*"

I tell you [the letter continued], nothing keeps one more humble than the memories of those who knew you *when*!

Indeed, nothing does. But it also intensifies one's gratitude to God for the grace which alone makes us sufficient for the tasks to which God calls us.

It is equally impossible to stand here without recognizing an indebtedness to, and acknowledging a gratitude for, those who have previously occupied this office. Francis Landey Patton, Joseph Ross Stevenson, John Alexander Mackay, and James Iley McCord are all *nomina clara et venerabilia* in the history of both American Presbyterianism and ecumenical Christianity. Of these four, only the last two are known to me personally. But that is sufficient exposure to greatness to compel assent to the observation of yet another correspondent, who surmised that succeeding such notables "must be like tiptoeing in the footsteps of giants." As true as that is, however, the impressive feature of this train is not the shoe size of my predecessors, but the clear and challenging direction established for the Seminary by their footprints. Here is a tradition with a trajectory. This is a heritage which provides us with what Dr. E. David Willis calls "future-shaping memory." The path blazed in our yesterdays charts the course of institutional purpose into our tomorrows. And that purpose is to serve the Lord Jesus Christ by preparing ministerial leadership that is able and willing to serve the Church under the Gospel in order that the Church may serve the world redemptively.

I

There is an intentional and essential paradox here. For we are speaking of *servant leaders*. In an essay entitled *The Servant as Leader*, Robert K. Greenleaf distinguishes between those who are leaders first and those who

are servants first. The former serve only after they have established themselves as leaders. The latter establish themselves as leaders only through their service. They desire first to serve others, to meet the genuine needs of others, to enhance the lives of others. As servants they become leaders because those who are served recognize that the servant knows and exhibits the better way. Servants become leaders because they develop followers, which is a necessary qualification of leadership.

Conventional wisdom tells us that the paradox of a servant leader is no paradox at all. It is a logical and an empirical contradiction. There are leaders and there are servants. The two classes meet at the point where the leaders are served and the servants are led. There may be leaders who serve out of strength, but there are no servants who lead out of weakness. Leadership and servanthood are like oil and water—they do not mix.

Jesus, however, contradicts the contradiction. He came to us "not to be served but to serve, and to give his life as a ransom for many." Whether this logion from Mark's gospel (10:45) represents the *ipsissima vox* of the historical Jesus or the prophetic voice of the primitive church, and whether or not it may be interpreted legitimately in terms of the Servant Songs of Second Isaiah, it accurately expresses the impression one receives of the intention of Jesus as attested in the synoptic gospels. He was and is, according to their testimony, the Servant of God who ministers to human need for liberation from the powers of sin and death, and who by his own death on the Cross effects that liberation. It is this service unto death which puts the teaching of Jesus on servanthood into

a fundamentally different category from, say, the "Service Above Self" motto of Rotary International. The point, however, is that out of his servanthood emerges his leadership. The one who serves is the one who is followed. His disciples follow because they are served. And the paradox is sealed by this—He who presents himself to us as our Servant is confessed by us as our Lord.

The meaning of this confession for Christian discipleship, then or now, is not readily appropriated. James and John, who in this context typify disciples in every era, appear ludicrous in their special pleading for position, privilege, and power at the right and left hands of the Messianic King. In spite of his repeated warnings that the way into the Kingdom of God is the way of death and resurrection, the brothers Boanerges do not understand their Servant Lord. And the indignation of the other ten at James and John proves not that they did understand but merely that they resented this attempted end-run on their own desired places of honor in the coming realm. What they all do know and fully believe, according to Jesus, is "that those who are supposed to rule over the Gentiles lord it over them, and their great ones exercise authority over them" (10:42). What they do not know and therefore have yet to acknowledge is that "it shall not be so among you; but whoever would be great among you must be your servant, and whoever would be first among you must be slave of all" (10:43-44). This is an example of what Ernst Käsemann calls "the eschatological reversal of values." Giving it a name, however, is not enough. What is called for is actual value reversal, if only pro-

leptically. For in this community which lives in the hope of the coming Son of man, the great ones are those who serve and the first among us are those who are the slaves of all.

If, then, the one we confess as Lord is our Servant Leader, if disciples are worthy of honor only because of their servanthood, and if the purpose of a Christian theological seminary is to prepare and train servant leaders for a Church called to minister to the world redemptively, what then does this mean for the seminary itself? What is the institutional significance of servanthood?

II

Such questions are of more than academic interest. They point up a problem which may be the most pressing social issue of our time. For, as Robert K. Greenleaf has observed, our modern world is decisively shaped not only by the industrial revolution and the technological revolution, but also by the *institutional revolution*. Within the last century, the West at least has become "institution-bound" in a way and to a degree previously unimagined. The Constitution of the United States, for example, makes no provision for corporate institutions. At the time of its drafting, the modern corporation was not yet a significant social phenomenon. We are able to compensate for this omission only because the Supreme Court has allowed corporations to be treated as "persons" before the law. Even in the next century, Karl Marx failed to perceive the consequences of the coming institutional revolution. His writings, therefore, afford no guidance to those who manage institutional life in a socialist state and who face the same problems

created by that life which we face.

The legal fiction of corporate institutions as "persons" suggests the nature of these problems. Institutions take on a life of their own, and like humans they tend to become self-serving. Yet, unlike humans, they lack the capacity for self-transcendence. This was Reinhold Niebuhr's point in his *Moral Man and Immoral Society*. People are moral because they can if they choose serve purposes beyond self-interest. Institutions are immoral because they serve only the purpose for which they were created.

Since Niebuhr wrote, however, the problem of institutional life has intensified. For we are discovering our inability to make our institutions, particularly our large institutions, serve the purposes they were formed to serve. Intended to be means to ends, they have become all too frequently ends in themselves. William Stringfellow thus identifies institutions with the "powers and principalities" attested in the Pauline letters. In *An Ethic for Christians and Other Aliens in a Strange Land*, he claims that the "powers and principalities" are "legion in species, number, variety, and name." They include:

all institutions, all ideologies, all images, all movements, all corporations, all bureaucracies, all traditions, all methods and routines, all conglomerates, all races, all nations, all idols.

Like human beings, he continues, the "principalities" have fallen:

the fallen principalities falsely and futilely claim autonomy from God, and dominion over human beings . . . thus disrupting and usurping

their godly vocation or blaspheming while repudiating their own vocation. . . .

In the Fall the purpose and effort of every principality is the dehumanization of life categorically.

With the Fall, the original order of creation is inverted. The inversion of institutional life means that rather than humans exercising dominion over their institutions, their institutions turn on them and exercise dominion over them. Deception is the *modus operandi* of the "principality." By "insinuating itself in the place of God," it deludes people into thinking and acting "as if the moral worth . . . of human beings is defined and determined by commitment and surrender—literally sacrifice—of human life to the survival interest, grandeur, and vanity of the principality." Further, the "principalities" feed on the undying illusion "that at least some institutions are benign . . . and within human direction, or can be rendered so by discipline or reform or revolution or displacement."

Although many moderns would feel uncomfortable with Stringfellow's language of biblical realism, few would deny that our modern institutions function in the manner described and make such totalitarian claims upon our lives. No wonder there is an increasing distrust and suspicion of "big" government, "big" business, "big" labor, and even "big" education within our society today.

III

Because theological seminaries are academies of the Church which have modeled themselves after universities, the current criticism of institutions of

higher learning can be painfully instructive. Basically, the lament is that modern universities have lost their *universitas*. This Latin word, it should be noted, means "corporation." It served during the Middle Ages, the time of university origins, to express the *purpose* of this community of scholars. Formed to nurture the life of the mind by the pursuit of truth for its own sake, the medieval university assumed that the knowledge of the various fields of human inquiry could be "incorporated," which is to say, united in one body of knowledge under the vision of Christian faith in the living God. This confidence in *universitas* led not only to the integration of knowledge itself, but to the integration of wisdom and virtue. Knowledge was a means to ethical ends. The result was the establishment of *communitas* among scholars, the ordering of truth governing the ordering of life. In short, the unity of truth created community among those who pursued it.

Today, as we know, all that has changed. The assumption of the unity of truth is viewed as a presumption. Knowledge is fractured into myriad disciplines and sciences, many of which cannot communicate with each other for lack of a common medium of discourse. The *university* has become a *multiversity*. Its original purpose has been supplanted by purposes, ranging from "research" for government and industry to job certification for students. Moreover, the integration of knowledge and ethics has been dissolved in favor of what Bishop Lesslie Newbigin described in his Warfield Lectures of last week as unrelated realms of "public fact" and "private opinion." In *Decadence and Renewal*

in the *Higher Learning*, Russell Kirk surveys the history of recent American education and specifies three of its "principal afflictions." They are:

First, purposelessness: loss of the objectives of wisdom and virtue, the old ends of formal education. . . .

Second, intellectual disorder: all integration and order of knowledge in flux. . . .

Third, gigantism in scale: the Lonely Crowd on the campus of Behemoth University.

Given modern cultural assumptions, how could it be otherwise? The loss of *universitas* through the surrender of its basic vision spells the end of *communitas*.

It is not my intention, however, to throw rocks at the universities, for I realize that I now live in a glass house. The situation in theological education is not fundamentally different. Although you would expect that here, if anywhere, the vision which originated *universitas* would be operative, reality disappoints your expectation. Theological knowledge has also gone the way of the world. Professor Edward Farley documents the course of this journey in his important book, *Theologia: The Fragmentation and Unity of Theological Education*. He traces diachronically the meaning of the term "theology" from its entrance into our Christian vocabulary to its present use. From the time of its initial association with *education* until now, there are three periods of development: "the period of pious learning (divinity), the period of specialized learning, and the period of professional education." Of the first he comments:

Divinity named not just an objective science but a personal knowledge of God and the things of God in the context of salvation. Hence, the study of divinity (theology) was an exercise of piety, a dimension of the life of faith.

The second period began with the introduction of the German concept of theological encyclopedia into the seminaries. Faculties were now formed and structured according to the four-fold departments of biblical studies, church history, systematic theology, and practical theology. This division of labor led inevitably to specializations of the academic areas and even sub-specializations within them. Two consequences have resulted, one theoretical and the other pedagogical. With regard to the first, it is now questionable whether the departments with their proliferation of disciplines are united by a common subject matter. Farley is compelled to ask whether there is any such thing as *theology* which unites this fragmentation of knowledge. With regard to the second consequence, there has been a shift not from piety to learning, but from one meaning of learning to another, "from study which deepens heartfelt knowledge of divine things to scholarly knowledge of relatively discrete theological sciences." The integrating factor here is the student, who increasingly is allowed to wander around for three years in the "open curriculum" under the promise that by the time she or he is a senior ready to graduate it will somehow "all come together." Further, the intrinsic relation between piety and learning is dissolved. In its place we have the parallel but not necessarily connected

processes of "theological formation" and "spiritual formation," the former being nurtured by "scholarly knowledge" and the latter by the Chapel, an occasional course on spiritual disciplines, and the prayer life of the student.

The inability or unwillingness of theologians to resolve the theoretical problem has led, according to Farley, to the third period which began some forty years or so ago. Here the unifying center of theological education is the concept of the minister as professional. He writes:

This new paradigm is not simply an affirmation that the ministry bears the sociological marks of a profession. On the basis of that affirmation, it recommends an education whose rationale lies in its power to prepare the student for designated tasks or activities which occur (or should occur) in the parish or in some specialized ministry. To the degree that this is the case, the theological student neither studies divinity nor obtains scholarly expertise in theological sciences, but trains for professional activities.

Clearly the vision of theological education which informed the founding of Princeton Theological Seminary by the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in 1811 was that of the study of divinity. The *Plan* of the Seminary specifies as one of its chief institutional purposes the following:

to unite in those who shall sustain the ministerial office, religion and literature; that piety of the heart which is the fruit only of the renewing and sanctifying grace of

God, with solid learning; believing that religion without learning, or learning without religion, in the ministers of the gospel, must ultimately prove injurious to the Church.

Historically speaking, of course, you would expect that. The *Plan* simply reflects the understanding of its time. But can we with integrity leave it at that? Can we content ourselves with being the children of our own time, accepting the fragmentation of knowledge, ignoring the question of the nature of *theologia*, avoiding the issue of curricular unity, and dismissing the concern of the old concept of divinity? Naturally, we can. But only at the price of ourselves contributing to that loss of purpose which characterizes the current crisis of public confidence in educational institutions.

Please do not hear this as a nostalgic plea for "the good old days" that never were. I agree with Karl Barth that the road back leads nowhere. Mine is a plea for a future shaped by the wisdom of our past, a future in theological education which finds a way to unite piety and learning, to unite the learning of the theological disciplines, and to unite learning and piety with the practice of ministry. My plea is for an institution which knows how to serve students so effectively that they are enabled to serve the Church that is called by God to serve the world redemptively. Yet, given the realities of institutional life as described by William Stringfellow, how is it possible for even a seminary to be a servant?

IV

Robert Greenleaf argues that the answer is *servant leadership*. The basis

of his argument is his perception of a newly developing social consciousness of power and authority. This is how he puts it:

A new moral principle is emerging which holds that the only authority deserving one's allegiance is that which is freely and knowingly granted by the led to the leader in response to, and in proportion to, the clearly evident servant stature of the leader. Those who choose to follow this principle will not casually accept the authority of existing institutions. *Rather, they will freely respond only to individuals who are chosen as leaders because they are proven and trusted as servants.* To the extent that this principle prevails in the future, the only truly viable institutions will be those that are predominantly servant-led.

My intuitions tell me that this is an accurate sociological description of the present situation. Yet if its theological dimension is ignored, the prescription of servant leadership is reduced to naive optimism. For the central problem of modern institutional life is its corruption by idolatry. Servanthood in this context is fruitless unless it is liberated from the worship of the institution which it seeks to lead.

Christian faith provides us here with two crucial insights. The first is that the "principalities and powers," despite their corruption by idolatry, are capable of servanthood because this is their purpose within the economy of God's good creation. In his valuable little book, *Christ and the Powers*, Hendrikus Berkhof makes the same connection as does Stringfellow between this Pauline teaching and the cultural and institutional forms of life in the

world. Berkhof emphasizes, however, that the "principalities and powers" are, according to the Colossian letter, created through Christ and for him (1:16). This means not only that all things created have their coherence in their Creator, but that they also receive their purpose from the same Source. Thus Berkhof argues:

By no means does Paul think of the Powers as evil in themselves. They are the linkage between God's love and visible human experience. They are to hold life together, preserving it within God's love, serving as aids to bind men fast in His Fellowship; intermediaries, not as barriers but as bonds between God and man. As aids and signposts toward the service of God, they form the framework within which such service must needs be carried out.

The believer's combat, therefore, is not against the "powers" as such, but against their corruption. And the arena of this combat is *within*, not *without*, the institutional structures of the world. We are not Gnostics. The world is a reality to be redeemed, not escaped.

The second insight provided by Christian faith is this: In Christ the institutional structures of the world have been *demythologized*. Again according to the Colossian letter, God has "disarmed the principalities and powers and made a public example of them, triumphing over them in [Christ]" (2:15). What is attested here is liberation from slavery to idolatry. The freedom envisioned here is determined by the nature of the bondage experienced.

In *The Reality of Faith*, Friedrich Gogarten gives us an important clue. He unpacks the contents of the idol-

atry which serves as the foil of the Pauline teaching on this subject. The basic assumption of the pre-Christian view of life which dominated the ancient world was the ultimate, all-embracing reality of the cosmos. This reality was believed ordered and upheld by the "principalities and powers" which controlled it. The conclusion drawn from this assumption was that the decisive human issue was how to adapt oneself to the order upon which life depended. To get along, you had to go along. Life was understood and defined in terms of its relationship to the world and its powers. The fulfillment of life was found in the fulfilling of the laws which govern the way the world works. In this way the world became a religious reality, and piety consisted in the service (the worship) of the world order and the powers which compose it.

Now it is precisely this belief in the power of the "powers" to define and fulfill human life which has been "disarmed" by God in Christ. Through the death and resurrection of Jesus, we are delivered from our worship of the world. We are liberated by the God who alone as our Creator has the authority to define and fulfill our lives. Liberation in Christ is not a matter of being set free from any and all authority. Christian freedom is recognizing the One whose authority is legitimate and then acknowledging it. As Professor Käsemann puts it, faith is a change of Lords. For the notion of human "autonomy" is but a modern myth. Human life is always lived in the service of something, if only itself. But in Christ we meet and are reconciled to the God who transcends the "principalities and powers," and who rules over them. When we per-

mit this God to define and fulfill our lives, we are freed from our enslavement to the world in order that we may serve God in the world.

Let me illustrate this by risking a personal application. I am now the president of a theological seminary and a member of its faculty. The academic world in which I now live has its own ethos, order, and standards. For me to live in this world successfully, I must adapt myself to its order, honor its ethos, and meet its standards. All of this is true and necessary. As a modern man, of course, I recognize that the "powers" which govern the world of academe are not divine. For me they have been demythologized, at least cosmologically. The issue, however, is whether or not they have been "disarmed" existentially for me. For if I allow this academic world to define my existence, if I look to it for the fulfillment of my life, then my relationship to it is idolatrous and I become not its free servant but its bonded slave. For I can truly serve this institution only if I serve it freely, and I can serve it freely only if I look steadfastly beyond it for the source, norm, and meaning of my existence.

What is true for me, I believe, is true for all. Servant leadership of a servant institution is possible for all who are liberated by God through Jesus Christ from the worship of the world and its "powers." The word "all" is used intentionally, for the leadership of an institution includes everyone who cares enough to serve it in freedom. Out of that servanthood the leadership will arise. Students, administrators, staff, faculty, trustees—all can be servant leaders. And the more there are who serve out of freedom, the more likely it will be a ser-

vant seminary. The issue is not one of governance. Leadership and governance are related, but they are not synonymous. Not everyone who leads governs, and not everyone who governs leads. James and John asked, "Who has the power?" But the question, according to Jesus, is "Who is willing to serve?"

V

I conclude now with a story and a promise. The story is about Dr. John Hubbard, the former president of the University of Southern California. On a trip to Texas, he met Tom Landry, the coach of the Dallas Cowboys. As a parting gift, coach Landry presented a Dallas Cowboy T-shirt to president Hubbard. Sometime later Dr. Hubbard donned this T-shirt, and went out to play a round of golf. His caddy noticed the T-shirt and said, "Sir, are you the coach of the Dallas Cow-

boys?" Without knowing why he did it, Hubbard replied, "No, I'm not the coach. I'm a scout." Deeply impressed, the caddy said, "I play football for Cerritos Junior College. Do you think I'd ever be able to play for the Cowboys?" Hubbard sized him up and responded, "I don't think you have the size to play professional football. But keep at it, for you never know what might happen." By the time he sank his last putt, Dr. Hubbard was feeling a little guilty over his subterfuge. So he turned to the caddy and said, "I'd like you to have this T-shirt, but I think it is too big for you." The young man looked up at him and said, "Oh, sir, don't you worry about that. I'll wear it until it fits."

That is my promise to you. This office is an extra-large T-shirt. It is too big for me, but by God's grace I will make every effort to grow into it.

The Charge to the New President

by DR. JAMES I. McCORD

PRESIDENT GILLESPIE, President Templeton and members of the Board of Trustees, members of the faculty and student body of Princeton Seminary, distinguished representatives of the academic and ecclesiastical communities, and other guests and friends: Let me extend hearty congratulations to the fifth President of Princeton Seminary and, at the same time, thank him for arranging California weather for this event. Let me congratulate the Board of Trustees on the selection of President Gillespie to guide the destiny of the Seminary in the next chapter of its life and witness. He stands in the classical Reformed tradition of the scholar-pastor, as well as in the tradition of this institution. He brings a rich background of Churchmanship, not only from the parishes which he has served, but also from service to many of the boards, agencies, and committees of the Church. This will stand him in good stead as he directs the affairs of this institution in the years ahead.

It is always difficult to give a charge to one's successor. I could stand here and give him advice but if he were smart, and he is, he would not listen. Or I could rehearse the past, and the audience would not listen. Let me, therefore, make three observations this afternoon.

First of all, it is the responsibility of the President to work to keep the Seminary free for the Church. Let me spell the word—"F-O-R"; not free from the Church but free for the

Church. The Seminary is called to exercise a prophetic role in the life of the Church. It is a community that is disciplined by the Word of God. It must be free in order to hear God's Word and to live by it. It is a responsibility of the Seminary Faculty to give theological direction to the Church. At a time when ideology has tended to replace theology, it is the responsibility of the Seminary to see that theology is reinstated in its queenly role in order that the Church may have direction in her life and mission. It is customary to say that the Church exists for mission as the fire exists for burning, but without the theology of the Gospel, there is nothing to fuel the fire and the flame becomes extinguished. The Seminary must be free for the Church in order to exercise this prophetic role in every generation. This is particularly true of Princeton Seminary at this point in the life of the Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.), when once again the whole structure and profile of the Church will be examined. Indeed, it is already being examined with an eye to see where we have misfired and gone wrong, and with an eye to how that mission can become more powerful in the closing years of the century.

For this Seminary there is a much greater role in the entire Reformed world. The Seminary has recaptured the meaning of what it means to be Reformed in the catholic sense, so that it can be related to the entire Christian family, helping to form and shape its leadership, using its resources everywhere. Nearly 100 denominations are represented in the student body each year.

A second responsibility is to regain standards that have lamentably slipped

in the last two decades. I am thinking particularly of standards in the world of academe. There has been an escalation of grades and a lowering of standards so that the gentleman's "C" has given way to a confused "B"! It is time that leadership be given toward the restoration of standards of excellence, especially in professional schools like seminaries. It is simply not true that you do not have to know very much to be a minister. A minister should be a person who can hold her or his own in any community and be able to give leadership in lifting moral standards and raising human vision. Of course, there are many problems, and I will not try to enumerate them now. Let me, instead, suggest that you read in the current issue of the *New Yorker* the article by Calvin Trillin on the Harvard Law School. Looking at the situation there, at least through the eyes of Trillin, is like looking not into a distant mirror, but into a contemporary mirror of what academic life is today. Strong leadership is needed to regain standards of performance and achievement and to resist the ever present pressure to let them be eroded by quotas or any other compromise.

Third, twenty-four years ago my

distinguished and beloved predecessor stood here and charged me in eloquent words, speaking on the theme of piety. Let me close with a word about piety in the classical sense of *pietas*. Piety has to do with duty. First of all, it is duty toward God, responsibility to our Creator-Redeemer. But it has also to do with duty to all those around us, in all of our human relationships. And by the time you reach Vergil, *pietas* meant justice and compassion. The pious person is the one who is responsible and dutiful, just and compassionate, the type of person that ought to exercise leadership, not out of a craving for domination, but because these qualities are present and are recognized as those of a leader. The felicitous phrase by J. Douglas Brown in his book, *The Human Nature of Organizations*, is "intuitive integrity." This is the quality that is required for leadership. This is the quality the Board of Trustees found in President Gillespie. He represents in a large and full measure that intuitive integrity that grows out of his dutifulness to God, his commitment to Jesus Christ, and his desire to serve.

May God bless you, my dear friend Tom, in all the years ahead.

The Inaugural Prayer

by DAVID B. WATERMULDER

Lord God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob,
God of Sarah, Rebekah, and Rachel,
God of the psalmists and prophets, the disciples and apostles,
God of our Lord Jesus Christ who is Lord over all,
God of those who have gone before us through the many centuries,
God of all those whose lives have molded this seminary—
 of Archibald Alexander and John Mackay,
 of leaders in our time like James McCord,
 of scholars both living and dead,
 of students who have found your presence here—

Our God, our Lord, our Guide:

Surrounded by so great a cloud of witnesses

We join with them in this sacred hour, exclaiming:

“Blessing and glory and wisdom and thanksgiving and honor
and power and might be unto our God forever and ever.”

O Lord, you have been our dwelling place in all generations.

From everlasting to everlasting, you are God.

A thousand years in your sight are but as yesterday when it is past.

Aware that you are Lord of the years,

 we pray your blessings upon us

 in this year, in this place, in this event,

 that this inauguration here today

 may become a means of grace to your people everywhere.

Give us the strength of the prophets

 to do justly, love mercy, and walk humbly with our God.

Give us the tenderness of the priests

 to minister to all who are weary and heavy laden.

Give us the compassion of the Christ

 who took the form of a servant and humbled himself,

 becoming obedient unto death,

 even death on a cross.

As this sacred day casts its shadow over the years yet to come:

May your blessings be upon this seminary

 and your spirit surround its new president,

 Thomas Gillespie.

May your wisdom attend its faculty,

 and commitment to Christ consume its students,

 as they prepare for ministry.

May your guidance direct its leaders

and your peace be upon its friends,
as they seek to serve.
But above all, O Lord, may the years ahead bring:
A new commitment to your kingdom
and a new concern for your people.
A new understanding of your grace
and a new awareness of all in need.
A new love of your Church
and a new compassion for the struggling peoples of the earth.
A new sense of the glory of ministry
and a new humility in performing it.
A new awareness of life in the late 20th century
and a new readiness to become the agents of your peace.

O God, who has called us together into one holy body, the Church of Jesus Christ: we offer our prayers for your Church everywhere. May your Spirit possess the newly formed Presbyterian Church, and may your blessing rest upon its seminaries, their presidents and leaders, their faculties and students. Bind us together in the larger Church with its many names and in its many places. Unite us with the Churches which nurtured us in centuries past and those which call us to the tasks of the century before us. Make us one in faith until your Church throughout the world radiates the power of your Spirit and the strength of your love.

And the God of peace
Who brought again from the dead our Lord Jesus,
That great shepherd of the sheep:
Through the blood of the everlasting covenant
Make us perfect in every good work to do his will,
Working in us that which is well pleasing in his sight
Through Jesus Christ,
To whom be the glory for ever and ever. Amen.

For the Work of Ministry

by J. RANDOLPH TAYLOR

TODAY is a new day in an old institution. The traditions of this place going back to 1812 look over the windowsills of eternity to see what transpires this day in 1984. And Tom, I want to commend you for the acceptance of the call to this place and to wish you and this faculty and student body and this institution as a whole the blessings and the prayers of the entire church for this new chapter in its and in your life. I notice it's raining today. And I remember the ancient rabbis used to say that if it rains on the day of a wedding, it predicts a very fertile marriage.

This old institution with its new day is part of another, older institution: the Presbyterian Church in this nation, that is also at the moment of a new day. And the saints from 1706 and from 1789 are looking over the threshold of eternity to behold what transpires for us as a denomination in 1984. And the word that I would say to you and to all of us today in old institutions experiencing new days is the word that the apostle wrote to the presbytery or the diocese of Ephesus: "I beg you to lead a life worthy of the calling to which you have been called."

Leadership in the life of the church is the gift of the Head of the church, just as the church itself is the gift of his Spirit. Leadership is a calling and a gift for an individual, for a com-

Born in Kiangsu province in China of missionary parents, J. Randolph Taylor is a graduate of Davidson College, Union Theological Seminary, Richmond, and Aberdeen University in Scotland. He has served churches in Washington, DC, and Atlanta, and is presently minister at the Myers Park Presbyterian Church in Charlotte, NC. In June 1983, he was elected the first moderator of the reunited Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.).

munity, for an institution like this. Now there are wide varieties of gifts given and the apostle alludes to these. Some are called to be apostles, some prophets, some evangelists, some pastors, some teachers. These are gifts and responsibilities and they do not come by simple human contriving. They come by the grace of God. John Calvin has said, "To Christ we owe it that we have ministers of the gospel, that they are bound in necessary qualifications, that they execute the trust committed to them. All, all is his gift." That is the newness of this morning, that the Spirit of God still has the capacity to call men and women into the life of leadership and ministry and to call the church into newness of life.

Ministry

These gifts are given, according to the apostle, for certain reasons. These gifts are given, he said, "for the equipping of the saints for the work of ministry"; or, as was read to us today, "to prepare the believers for Christian service"; or as Clarence Jordan says in his *Cottonpatch Version of Paul's Epistles*: "To shape the believing folks into a working force."

The insight of the New Testament is that all are ministers, that by baptism we are brought into the responsibility for ministry and for service. And these word gifts of the Spirit are

given to draw forth the ministry of others. What is called for here is not for us to be the ministry, but for us to equip the ministers for the work of ministry. What is called for here is a service-oriented rather than a survival-oriented church. A church that recognizes that its life and work is for others precisely because the Head of the church was for others.

Jesus' word to his apostles is a clear word that he or she who seeks to save his life will lose it, but he or she who loses his life for my sake or for the gospel's will find it. That word of our Lord's, if we have thought of it at all, is always thought of in terms of individual application. But it seems to me that that is the marching order for the church. That if we seek simply to save our life we're going to lose it. It is only as we lose our life in the Lord's reality of the Kingdom and the gospel that we are going to find it at all. That is true for ministers of the Word, and that is true for ministers or members in the church. That is true for the whole of the people of God and that is true for its congregations and for its governing bodies and for its institutions. So long as we think simply in terms of survival we are in serious danger. It is only as we understand that the gifts, all the gifts, are given in order to equip God's people for the work of ministry, to shape the believing folks into a working force.

Now, that's our task then as ministers of the Word. To be ministers to the ministers and servants to the servants. Robert Greenleaf of AT&T in his book, *Servant Leadership*, describes well the fact that no institution has any reason for being other than that of service. And his classic example, out of the corporate structures of

managing America, is the church. And the height of that example is the seminary, which must be the servant of the servants of the servants. These words are given, first of all, for ministry.

Unity

But then the apostle goes on: "for the equipping of the saints for the work of ministry, until we all attain to the unity of faith and the knowledge of the Son of God." Ministry, but also unity. These gifts are given to help people to minister and to help the community to experience its unity. Paul thinks a great deal in this passage about unity. "We have one body," he said. "One spirit, one hope that belongs to our calling. One Lord, one faith, one baptism, one God and Parent of us all, who is above and through and in all."

Now he's thinking of unity not only as a gift but also as a goal. These gifts are given until we all attain to the unity of faith and the knowledge of the Son of God. The word used, "to attain," is used nine times in a very pragmatic way in the book of Acts to describe travellers who have finally reached their destination. So, unity is first of all a gift which the Spirit gives us, and it is a goal which stands before us.

The Presbyterian church in this nation during this past twelve months has experienced a gift of unity. Oh, not an exhaustive unity by any means, but unity: unity which the Spirit gives. It happened to us as we came to the point of realizing that it was time to break down a wall, a partition, that had divided us for too long. As I have had the privilege of traveling around the church this year, I find that Pres-

byterians, North and South and East and West, are realizing that something very good has happened to us. We have received a gift of unity. Even in places where they could not so much as find a former Southern Presbyterian, there's a recognition that what we've done is right. We were in the right place at the right time, and we did the right thing. And we so seldom do that, we want to celebrate it when it takes place. So that what I sense going on in Presbyterianism this year is a kind of recognition of an unwrapping of a gift, the gift of unity. And a realization that this is not something that we manipulated or organized. This is something that was given to us by the Spirit of God. This is unity which the Spirit gives.

Part of the joy of this year for me has been the hearing of the word from older men and women, heroines and heroes of the church in former generations, who have said a word about this moment of Presbyterian reunion, and almost all of them have said exactly the same thing: "I never thought I'd live to see it." And I expect that's true of all of us. We never thought we'd live to see it. All of you have seen the moderator's cross, and most of you know the story of how it came into being. Harrison Ray Anderson, pastor of Fourth Church, Chicago, traveling in Scotland in 1948, visiting the Island of Iona—the cradle of Christianity for Scotland and a great deal more—buying a silver cross, a Celtic cross like the crosses on the tombs by the Abbey, getting on the boat to go to Oban and then a thought struck him. And he went back and bought a second, identical silver cross. When he got back to this country he presented one to the moderator of the then Presbyterian Church, U.S. and

the other to the moderator of the then Presbyterian Church, U.S.A., in the prayer that the time would come when these two crosses could be put together in symbol of the reconciliation of the Presbyterian family in this land. Three years later a third silver cross was brought from Iona and given to the moderator of the then United Presbyterian Church in North America. For almost a decade those three denominations worked on the matter of Presbyterian reconciliation. And, in the providence of God, in the year 1958 on a rainy day in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, two of those denominations came together to form the United Presbyterian Church in the United States of America. And for twenty-five years, a quarter of a century, the moderator of that denomination has worn two of these crosses riveted together. The moderator of the Presbyterian Church (U.S.) has continued to wear the lonely cross.

Just about a year ago it was obvious that the presbyteries had voted overwhelmingly throughout the whole continent for the reality of reconciliation in our time. There was a great deal of interest in how the crosses would be put together. Not least of all, those interested included my wife's father, W. M. Johnson. He was living with us at the time because he was dying of cancer. Mr. Johnson was not a pastor. He was not a minister of the Word. As a matter of fact, Mr. Johnson was not a very pious man. Mr. Johnson sold tractors and tires all his life. He had three children. His son became a Presbyterian minister, and his two daughters married Presbyterian ministers. As he used to say, "There's not a breadwinner in the bunch." He also used to say that he must have been a very bad man to

require three Presbyterian ministers to work on him most of his adult life. But he wasn't a bad man. He was a very practical man. He had heard the story of Harrison Ray Anderson and the crosses. He wanted very much to go to Atlanta and see the crosses put together. But by the time of Atlanta and the General Assembly, it was obvious that he could not make the trip. So he said to me just before we left, "If you have anything to do with the way in which they put those crosses together, see that they do that out in front of everybody. Don't let them carry that off to a jewelry shop or do that in a closet somewhere, because what people can see they can more readily understand." Well, when we got to Atlanta, we discovered that we were not simply meeting side by side to get acquainted with one another. We were there to unwrap a gift, the gift of unity; to experience what happens with the rush of the Spirit when brothers and sisters dwell together in unity.

Those of us who shared together in the Atlanta Assembly were marked spiritually by the event. We met separately in assembly halls and voted ourselves out of separate existence, voting to adjourn *sine die*—never to meet again. And there were some damp eyes in both halls because of the recognition of providence over the past pilgrimage. And then we met in the streets of the city. What a marvelous symbol of unity, for the church to meet in unity in the midst of the world. And there we marched through the streets of Atlanta, led by brass bands and bagpipe bands. We discovered to our great surprise that we know all four verses of "The Church's One Foundation" by heart. And we know three and a half verses of "Blest be the Tie that Binds." And we know

the first verse of a whole lot of other hymns as well.

That night we celebrated communion and we don't know how many people were there, nor how many people shared with us by satellite in satellite communion services. We sang the "Hallelujah Chorus" at the top of our voices. But for me the high point came when an Asian-American, the chairman of jewelry working at Georgia State University, stood before some ten thousand Presbyterians with his hands shaking, because, as he said, "I've never seen that many people in one room, much less worked in front of them." He put his anvil down on the presiding table and he took the moderators' crosses and put them together and he slipped a rivet in through the three crosses. And then with several blows of his hammer that sent sparks flying upward and rings through the room, he sealed together this symbol of the reconciliation of the Presbyterian family in this land.

When the Assembly was over Arline and I drove back to Charlotte and discovered that Mr. Johnson had lost a great deal of ground. He did not know that we were at home. And I went off to a presbytery celebration of reunion and came back the next day. Arline met me at the back door to tell me that he was much clearer. I went in and sat on the bed beside him. We talked about the Assembly, about reunion, about the celebration, and I told him about how they put the crosses together and he held it in his hand and he smiled and leaned back on his pillow. And I went off to an appointment at the church, and Arline called me two hours later to tell me that he was gone. Now, I share our family story with you in part simply to remind you that it has not just

been those who share communion wine and break communion bread; it has also been those who sell tractors and tires who have yearned and who have worked and who have prayed and who, by the grace of God, have lived to see this day. And it includes us.

So the gift of unity gives us a moment of opportunity to strive toward attaining the unity of faith and of the knowledge of the Son of God. It is a gift and at the same time it is a goal—to give expression to the unity which the Spirit gives, to enlarge it and extend it and let it grow until it embraces all. The apostle means that these gifts are given to us in part to help people in their ministry, but also to help the community in its unity. We are to help the church become the agent of reconciliation for the sake of the world, to become aware of a sacred oneness, a mutual interdependence, a responsible and genuine sense of joy at discovering one another and the community which Christ gives. It does not mean that we all look alike or that we all think alike or that we all are alike. That kind of unity by cultural cloning is a form of idolatry whereby we put our ideas or our tradition as the standard to which others must come. No, unity is a gift and also a goal, and thus we are free to express the rich diversity which is possible within that unity. And it comes by faith and by the knowledge of the Son of God. So what is the seminary? The seminary must be a community that sends out the builders of community. That's why the gifts are given.

Maturity

And one thing more: "Until we all attain to the unity of faith and the

knowledge of the Son of God, to mature personhood, to the measure of the stature of the fullness of Christ." Why are the gifts given? For ministry and for unity and for maturity as well. For community does not live for itself. It lives always related to the process that leads toward the future and the apostle wants us not simply to grow old but to grow up. The apostle wants all ministers so to do: "no longer being children tossed to and fro and carried about by every wind of doctrine." Have you ever wondered why the American people are so fickle and so easy to follow the latest fad not only in fashions and foods but also in faith? It's precisely because of hunger for the ministry to maturity. It's because we are children tossed to and fro, carried about by every wind of doctrine, by the craftiness and deceitful wiles of men and women.

There's much talk in the land about being born again, and that's all right up to a point. The difficulty with that perspective by itself is that the result of it is inevitably stunted growth and spiritual infants, whose primary exercise is calling attention to their own birthday. It is well for us to know when we have come into newness of life, but it is also well for us to no longer be children tossed to and fro and carried about by every wind of doctrine.

Maturity stands for something much more than old age. Maturity has to do with setting a standard that is constantly challenging and growing toward that—the measure of the stature of the fullness of Christ. It has seemed to me that as we grow in life we come to new questions along the way. As young men and women we almost all ask the question, "How do I look?"

It's inevitable. It's part of who we are. We want to know what kind of impression we're making. Ultimately we move on beyond that to a realization that that doesn't really quite get at the vocational possibilities before us. And so we begin to raise a more mature question: "What shall I do?" Sometimes it's raised desperately. And sometimes it's raised quite searchingly for vocation: "What shall I do?" And then, as we continue to grow, it seems to me our question changes at least once more, and we begin to ask another question: "Why am I here?" There's a sense in which we're always asking all three at the same time and some of us who are old and wrinkled still go back to "How do I look?" But the truth is that the challenge always is to continue to grow and to grow up into him who is the Head. It is a personal and corporate challenge in understanding that the church is a body, given unity and challenged to live it out by growing toward the standard of the Head of that body.

How do we do it? "Rather, speaking the truth in love"—and that's part of spiritual maturity; to be able to be candid and caring at one and the same time, to be open and affectionate, to be accurate but also affirming. "Rather, speaking the truth in love, we are to grow up in every way into him who is the Head, into Christ." Not just growing old but growing up in every way and helping our people, the ministers by baptism in the pews and places of worship and of life, helping them to sense the great process not only of ministry and of unity but of maturity. It means learning to live by grace, by mutual relationships and by mutual forgiveness. Learning to laugh at our-

selves, and learning the key to true humility which is not stooping down so low as it is standing up as tall as we can before someone who is so much greater than we are.

And so what is the seminary? A seminary literally is a seedbed, a growing place that helps growing people to go out to help people grow. It was 1972, the place was the Boston School of Theology, it was commencement, and in a rash moment the Administration and Faculty had invited the oldest living alumnus to come back and speak. He was in his upper 90s. And as the time came everyone grew nervous. A lifetime of ministry to be reported on in a single situation. They asked him to come and say what he thought about his place of theological education. They helped him to the podium and he stood just long enough to say, "I want to thank you for setting me free without setting me adrift." And he sat down.

How do we help people to grow to maturity? That's the discipline of this community, as we grow into him who is the Head. We are cursed in the church with too low an ideal. We are cursed in the church with too comfortable a standard, with too easy a hope. The apostle's insight is that we are called together and we are called into the future for ministry and for unity and for maturity. You never grow beyond that standard and you never graduate beyond that challenge. For he is the Head, "from whom the whole body joined and knit together by every joint with which it is supplied—when each part is working properly—makes bodily growth and upbuilds itself in love."

In the name of the Creator and of the Christ and of the Comforter. Amen.

The Zeal for Truth and Tolerance: Spiritual Presuppositions of Christian Ministry

by JAN MILIČ LOCHMAN

Dr. Jan Milič Lochman is a native of Czechoslovakia. He served as professor of theology on the Comenius Faculty in Prague from 1950 to 1968. Since 1969 he has been professor of systematic theology at the University of Basel, where he presently is also Rector. He is the author of numerous works, including The Theology of Praise (1982).

THE INAUGURATION of the new president of Princeton Theological Seminary is more than a festive occasion for one particular theological school; it is an ecumenical event. I state this out of personal experience and conviction both as a theologian of Czech origin and as a representative of Basel University.

Among Czechoslovak Protestants, Princeton stands as a place not only of deep theological learning but also of ecumenical solidarity as it was personalized in that happy union between Prague and Princeton in the person of our unforgotten Josef L. Hromádka. In Switzerland, the *alma mater Basiliensis*, one of the oldest universities of the Reformed tradition on the continent of Europe, has a natural kinship to its sister, *alma mater Princetoniensis*, one of the oldest universities of Reformed background in America. Many distinguished names could be recalled as symbolizing these special relations. Let me name only two, the names of the two last Princeton Seminary presidents: John A. Mackay and James I. McCord. These names have again and again inspired feelings of incomparable ecumenical trust and fraternal solidarity, particularly in Eastern Europe. Dr. Gillespie is now called to continue the great tradition of Princeton in that rich heritage. Let me assure him of our sym-

pathy and of our prayers. There are many not only in this chapel, not only in this city, not only on this continent who join us in their prayers on this day.

The general theme of these Inaugural events is "Ministry in a United Church," the theme making it clear from the very beginning that there is no other legitimate home base for theology than the *communio sanctorum*, the church. It is my task to inquire into the spiritual presuppositions of such a ministry, concentrating particularly on the ministry of theological education. My thesis is suggested by the title, "Zeal for Truth and Tolerance." A faithful and responsible leadership in the field of theology is characterized by the spirit of truth and tolerance.

The "Sitz im Leben," the existential background for such a formulation, is given by my ecumenical and academic experience of the last decades both in the East and in the West. I think of the processes of polarization within our churches and societies. Dangers obviously threaten from both sides. There is a zeal for truth which violates and destroys tolerance. Everyone knows how many zealous, militant, and fanatical contenders for truth have acted in history—past and present. There is a murderous zeal for truth, which insists on truth at all

costs—*fiat veritas pereat mundus!*—an excluding, excommunicating zeal, the “ayatollah mentality” which has so often been displayed even by Christian theologians (and, of course, by ardent atheist ideologues too).

But on the other side, as well, there is a tolerance which shies away from any reference whatever to the truth; a type of human behavior characterizing those who no longer believe anything themselves and therefore find it easy to be tolerant. We find examples of this, too, in history, past and present, in the camp of the skeptics and radical relativists or even nihilists. Here there is a radical refusal to serve in the quest for truth; binding decisions and partisanship are here avoided on principle. Here any zeal for truth displayed by the others is greeted with pained resignation or, worse still, with a cynical smile and the familiar counterquestion: What is truth?

It is perhaps here, in this controversial area so packed with tensions for church, culture, and society, that we are confronted with one of the most critical challenges of our time. Both for the spirit of our ministry and for the spiritual health of civilization itself, the responses we make to this challenge are of considerable importance. The challenge is addressed to all alert contemporaries and, in particular, to every member of an academic community. In what follows, the two main poles of our theme will be examined in the two successive sections, followed by a concluding personal testimony.¹

¹ On the theological concept of truth, cf. F. Buri, J. M. Lochman, H. Ott, *Dogmatik im Dialog II*, Gütersloh 1974, pp. 33ff. On the issue of tolerance, cf. my book *Church in a Marxist Society*, New York 1970, pp. 135ff.

I

Zeal for truth is deeply rooted in our Jewish and Christian tradition. The Czech Reformer, Jan Hus, expressed the basic commitment of Christian faith and life in the following summons: “Faithful Christian, search for truth, hear the truth, learn the truth, hold the truth, defend the truth until death.”² Hus was faithful to the central emphasis of the biblical message. The zealous concern for truth is a fundamental element and motivation of the prophetic and apostolic witness.

The message and ministry of the prophets of Israel as so vividly exemplified in the life of a Moses, the struggle of an Elijah, or the sufferings of a Jeremiah, was surely this: zeal for the honor, the name, the truth of Yahweh! However diverse the individual prophets and their destinies, the one common denominator in every case is surely this active zeal for Yahweh’s glory, for His incomparable Name, for the incontestable claim of His truth. This comes out with blazing clarity in the supreme affirmations of Israel’s faith: in the *Shema Israel*, for example, or the First Commandment of the Decalogue, “Hear, O Israel! The Lord our God is *one* Lord. Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, with all thy soul, and with all thy strength!” (Deuteronomy 6:4f.). “Thou shalt have no other gods beside Me!” (Exodus 20:3). Here, in this exclusive and all-inclusive devotion to the one God, named by His name, Yahweh, to the one God for whom there are no substitutes, is the root and source of the prophets’ zeal for truth.

The zeal for truth of the New Tes-

² Jan Hus, *Vyklad viry*, c.5 (Czech “Exposition of Faith”).

tament apostles also has its root and source in the prophetic fire. The *feu sacré*—the sacred flame—of Easter and Pentecost propels them forward in an eschatologically accelerated movement out “into all the world.” This becomes particularly evident in the case of Paul, unquestionably the most zealous of all the apostles. But his is no indiscriminate zeal. From his own personal experience as a former persecutor, he knew only too well that there is such a thing as a mistaken zeal (Philippians 3:6). It is no accident that “zeal” (in the sense of blind passion) occurs in the apostle’s catalogue of vices (Galatians 5:20). Clearly, there is such a thing as an “unlightened” zeal for God, a “zeal without knowledge” (Romans 10:2) and Paul warns his fellow Christians against it. This warning must be borne in mind. The criterion which determines the legitimacy of our zeal for truth is not its intensity, not the temperature of a zealous temperament, but the element of truth itself. In this element legitimate zeal prospers and is to be developed and displayed.

To understand more fully what this means, let us turn to a central New Testament expression of this zeal for truth, an axiomatic statement which is also open to misunderstanding: “There is salvation in no one else” (Acts 4:12). This pithy statement is found in one of the first Christian sermons (presented in the usual stylized literary form in Acts), in which Peter explains why, despite explicit prohibition and the risk of persecution, the apostles are unable to give up confessing their faith in the crucified and risen Jesus Christ. The sentence quoted is no fortuitous one but reflects a recurring emphasis of the New Testa-

ment message. Although the New Testament witness is a complex one borne by a mixed chorus of voices whose underlying harmony it is not always easy to discern, there is a constant *cantus firmus* audible in this polyphony, namely, its attestation of the unique and radical importance of the life and history of the man from Nazareth. John states it as follows: “Grace and truth came through Jesus Christ” (John 1:17). The apostle Paul testifies to this basic conviction by affirming: “No other foundation can anyone lay than that which has been laid, which is Jesus Christ” (1 Corinthians 3:11). And Peter, continuing the statement we have quoted, avers: “For there is no other name under heaven given among men by which we must be saved” (Acts 4:12).

This is a remarkable unanimity—as well as a prodigious claim to truth. It is not just to our pluralistically attuned ears that this sounds like a “tall order”; it already came as something of a shock to the people in the apostles’ audiences. When primitive Christianity appeared on the stage of Hellenistic religious history, people were confronted with a movement which adopted a very different strategy from that of the prevailing religious syncretism. When the early Christian missionaries turned up in the various Areopagi near and far in their society, they were, of course, quite ready to be “Jews to the Jews and Greeks to the Greeks” (1 Corinthians 9:20), ready to enter sympathetically into the specific cultural and intellectual situation of their fellow human beings, but this never implied any readiness to treat the name and truth of Jesus Christ as in any sense relative and exchangeable.

The result was a provocative breach of the generally accepted rules of the bewilderingly exuberant "market in possible religions" with its mutual trading in salvation and saviors. In their zeal for truth, Christians insisted on the clear and historically attested contours of the truth they attested. The salvation they proclaimed had a quite distinct profile, the human face of Jesus of Nazareth. To most of their religious contemporaries, this seemed like unfair competition, and even evidence of religious crudity and naivety. Under the pressure of this "public opinion," indeed, attempts would soon be made even in the Church itself to soften this "hard line" and to reach compromises. The apostolic message proved extremely unwilling, however, to yield to syncretistic temptations. "There is salvation in no one else; for there is no other name . . . by which we must be saved."

The key question in our present context is this: Are we to interpret this powerful emphasis as an intolerant claim to absoluteness and exclusivity? Was it here that the tracks were irrevocably fixed leading eventually, with iron necessity, to the syndromes of fanaticism and intolerance which later marred the course of Christianity in history? The fact that some historians and philosophers incline to this conclusion makes us pause for reflection. Several considerations, however, warn us against accepting their arguments too easily. If we are to track the specific apostolic zeal for truth down to its source, a more concrete and detailed examination of the biblical context of this short axiomatic statement is called for. What inspires it is no evil spirit of opinionated exclusiveness but a spirit of a very different kind. Three

points at least seem to me to be worth making.

1. *There is salvation in no one else.* This statement has a quite clear and specific reference, not to some anonymous or even arbitrary subject but, on the contrary, to a quite definite subject who is even named: Jesus Christ. What is set forth here is not an abstract doctrine of the absolute. It is faith which is attested here, faith in Jesus the Lord; faith, moreover, in Jesus Christ alone, not faith, for example, in Christians or Christianity. This is not a statement about the "absoluteness of Christianity." The attempts so often made under this rubric in modern religious philosophy and theology, with a view to demonstrating the superiority of Christianity over all other religions, is basically of no interest to the New Testament. The apostles preach not themselves, not the wealth of their own ideas or their own radiant virtues, but exclusively "Christ and him crucified" (1 Corinthians 1:23). This is quite crucial and must be taken with the utmost seriousness: in the light precisely of the cross, all human claims—even and especially all Christian claims—are radically "crossed out." If Christians should nevertheless persist in parading them, even *ad maiorem ecclesiae gloriam*—for the greater glory of the Church—then shades of a spiritual schizophrenia become visible; they are a living contradiction of the real basis of their faith.

2. *There is salvation in no one else.* This statement refers not only to a specifically named person but also to the history inseparable from that name: the history of Jesus of Nazareth. It is given its substantial content by this history. It is not an empty statement

(or claim) which can be arbitrarily assigned content but one which has already been given its own obligatory profile. Its direction and thrust are indicated by the history of Jesus, and this has an unmistakable central characteristic—namely, Jesus' devotion to his fellow human beings in their manifold need. This is no nebulous devotion but a sharply profiled one of partisanship and identification with those who are pushed to the edge of society, its outcasts, "the weary and heavyladen" (Matthew 11:28). But precisely in this "bias" it is not exclusive; rather it is an unconditional devotion transcending all barriers and prejudices. It is this history (and not any other) which the evangelists and prophets interpret as "God's exodus to humanity," to the near and the far. And they follow him in their mission, in a welcoming, inclusive movement, not a dismissive, excluding one, for in Jesus Christ "there is neither Jew nor Greek, neither slave nor free, neither male nor female" (Galatians 3:28). When the primitive Christian community proclaims that "there is salvation in no one else," it is to this definite history which crosses all frontiers that it is bearing witness. The implication of this, however, is that the clear-cut confession of Christ and his way, far from building any barriers between human beings, radically challenges all such barriers. The "exclusive" starting point of the Christian faith inaugurates an "inclusive" history.³

³ On the dialectic of the "exclusivity" and "inclusivity" of salvation, see my book *Reconciliation and Liberation. Challenging a One-Dimensional View of Salvation*, tr. David Lewis, Christian Journals Limited, Belfast, Dublin, Ottawa, 1980, esp. pp. 33ff.

3. *There is salvation in no one else.* In the name and history of Jesus Christ, what is at stake is salvation. In other words, we are confronted here not just with something neutral and ambivalent, nor even with a combination of both "Yes" and "No" (still less with a hybrid "Yesno!"), but with God's "Yes" to us all. In what way is witness to be borne to such salvation? In a way which would suggest that this salvation is a special privilege of us Christians? That hardly chimes with the history of Christ himself. On the contrary, we are to bear witness to this salvation as a summons to faith, as an invitation to our fellow human beings to "climb aboard" the salvation history, to join in passing on this "good news for all" to our fellow human beings. For it is "good news," not an ambiguous message. The Greek New Testament knows the *euangelion*—the Gospel—not a *dysangelion*, not a message of doom. This is an offer of grace, and both terms here must be given their full value. It is an offer—urgent, certainly, but no impersonal *Diktat*; and it is an offer of grace—certainly not cheap, undemanding grace, yet not overriding compulsion either. It was a wicked mistake when the Church, after it had become powerful, legitimized its evangelistic practice of compulsory conversion by an appeal to, of all things, the generously welcoming parable of the "Great Banquet" (Luke 14:15-24) in which, with a refreshing absence of prejudice and disregard for deeply anchored conventions, Jesus shows his particular concern for the onlookers of the kingdom of God. It was a sinful misunderstanding if the only point the Church noticed in this parable—and even this on the basis of a mistranslation—was the *compelle*

intrare (compel them to come in)! Far from being in any sense authorized by the primitive Christian confession of faith, "There is salvation in no one else," such a strategy is a complete contradiction of it.

What are the implications of these three points for our theme "zeal for truth and tolerance"? In the first place, they give the lie to the assumption that the unambiguous New Testament confession of Christ is bound logically to lead to intolerant behavior. If we take seriously what this confession says, and especially its naming of Jesus Christ, it points in quite a different direction, namely, towards co-humanity in solidarity.

But Christian theologians are well-advised not to insist too emphatically and self-confidently on this repudiation. The gales of church history blow in our faces telling us that the facts are against us in this respect! We cannot and should not deny that it *was* possible for an unambiguous confession of Christ to develop in the direction of a mistaken exclusivity, a claim to monopoly, arrogance, into aggression and inquisition. *Vestigia terrent*—the footprints frighten us because they lead to our own door. In the house of the Church and theology there is still much cleaning up to be done in the matter of tolerance. But the obligation to learn from the mistakes of the past does not require us to abandon the biblical zeal for truth. We must not throw away the baby—the Christmas baby—with the bathwater. As the three points just made have shown, there is no inevitable direct connection between the confession of Christ and intolerance.

In the light of the confession of Christ, however, is that *all* we can say

on the theme of "zeal for truth and tolerance"? Do we have to be content with this somewhat qualified and defensive answer that there is no inevitable connection between this faith and intolerance? Or can the argument be taken further and this provisional answer developed in a positive way? In other words, can we move in the direction of a mutually enriching convergence between the two poles in this field of tension? I am persuaded that this is possible. Which brings me to the second stage in the argument of this essay, in which attention will be focussed primarily on the theme of tolerance.

II

The development of the concept and reality of tolerance in the history of civilization and in contemporary practice is a complex one. Tolerance "can be taken to cover the whole range of gradations, from the mere recognition of freedom of conscience (provided the dissenter keeps his opinions to himself and does not publicize them), to the higher stage where the right to practice religion first privately and then to hold public services is guaranteed, up to the highest level of all, where all religions dissenting from that which originally had exclusive rights are freely permitted."⁴ The several stages form a coherent movement and merge into one another, because the history of tolerance is a dynamic one with a built-in momentum in the direction of "higher stages," though, of course, with frequent relapses.

The complexity of the reality of tolerance itself is matched by the com-

⁴ E. Hassinger, *Religiöse Toleranz im 16. Jahrhundert*, Aeneas Silvius Foundation Lectures VI, Basle 1966, p. 6.

plexity of its underlying motivation. In the history of toleration in the West, a variety of impulses were operative. The Toleration Edict of Joseph II⁵ reminds us of the considerable contribution made by the rationalism of the Enlightenment: the conviction that there is only one rational human nature common to all human beings makes it possible not merely to tolerate but even to respect its diverse historical expressions in religions and cultures. Even earlier than this, of course, the humanists of the Reformation period worked for toleration. There is the work of an Erasmus or a Castellio,⁶ for example, who were led in this same direction both by the tradition of antiquity and the spirit of the Gospel, away from fanaticism of every kind and towards tolerance. Nor can we ignore the heartening contribution of such patently *Christian* thinkers as Jan Amos Comenius, who, despite serious opposition close to home, brought into prominence once again basic elements in the biblical faith which are favorable to tolerance, such as the biblical emphasis on the supremacy of God's truth and grace over all human judgments; and the recognition that our zeal for truth can only find authentic expression in that loving solidarity with our fellow human beings which we find concretely

embodied in the life and teaching of Jesus of Nazareth. Nor should the reminder of these impulses blind us to the fact that the history of toleration not only had its intellectual and spiritual motivation but also its only too solid economic and political dimension. The French jurist and man of letters, Etienne Pasquier, wittily summed up the bitter experience of this latter dimension in his couplet of 1570:

Qui voudra Réunir avec Ruiner
mettre
Il verra qu'il n'y a transport que
d'une lettre!⁷

In other words, an intolerant and dictatorial religious policy leads to economic ruin.

There is no call to play up any of these different motivations to tolerance at the expense of the others. Each in its own way helped to ward off the dangers of fanaticism and intolerance in human society. The same is also true even of the moods of weariness at the unanswerable question of truth and of the tendencies to a skepticism and relativism which sometimes end up in an attitude of utter indifference. Yet this ambiguous diversity of motivation makes delimitation necessary. From the theological standpoint, at any rate, we must affirm quite categorically that tolerance in the Chris-

⁵ This Toleration Edict, published in the autumn of 1781, granted the remnants of the severely persecuted Evangelical Christians in central Europe, in Bohemia and Moravia (and in the whole territory of the Hapsburg monarchy) the limited freedom to practice their religion publicly.

⁶ Cf. W. Kaegi, *Castellio und die Anfänge der Toleranz*, Basle University Addresses No. 32, 1953 and H. R. Guggisberg, *Sebastian Castellio im Urteil seiner Nachwelt vom Späthumanismus bis zur Aufklärung*, Basle 1956.

⁷ Quoted by E. Hassinger, *op. cit.* p. 20. The French could be rendered: "There's not much difference between 'reunite' and 'ruinate'!" The justification of this warning has frequently been confirmed. After the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes, for example, War Minister Vauban estimated in a memoir that "by the persecution of the Huguenots, France has lost 100,000 inhabitants, 60 million in cash, 9,000 sailors, 12,000 trained soldiers and 600 officers" (quoted by E. G. Rüsch, *Toleranz*, Zürich 1955, p. 20).

tian sense can never be equated with indifference. Not only because zeal for truth and the Christian confession demand decision in the matter of truth, but also because the command to love God and our neighbor excludes relationships of sheer indifference. Love courts the fellow human beings, sides with them, and therefore struggles with them for the truth.

As the Christian understands it, therefore, tolerance does not mean a non-committal "laissez-faire" attitude of indulgence. It is not *indifferentia* (indifference) but rather a transaction *in differentiā* (in the difference); in other words, a transaction in which differences are mutually related and patiently borne with. As Gollwitzer says: "In its broadest sense, tolerance is patience with the other human being in his or her difference."⁸ Understood in this way, therefore, to be tolerant does not mean making light of tensions and hushing them up in a relativistic way, as if the question of truth were of no real consequence at all. In the words of a Quaker and pacifist: "Tolerance is the battlefield on which the struggle for truth is to be waged."⁹

But is it really possible in practice to stick to this conception of tolerance

with all its inherent tensions? Do not the demons of intolerance which we are trying to exorcise here once again spring to life? There is no denying this danger. Further clarification is required. A reminiscence from the field of biblical theology may help us forward a little.

There is a nuanced discussion of our theme in Rudolf Bultmann's commentary on John's Gospel, precisely at the point, moreover, where Bultmann seeks to interpret the important Johannine "I am," one of the most emphatic passages in the New Testament witness to Christ and truth. "The *ego eimi* of Jesus always means that there is only *one* leader to salvation, only *one* revealer. In the matter of salvation there is only the one possibility, not many different possibilities. A decision is demanded. Herein lies the intolerance of revelation. . . . It is, of course, the revelation which is intolerant. Human beings can only be tolerant to each other, and, to the degree they are called to represent the intolerant claim of revelation, this claim is directed first and foremost against themselves. When the *homo religiosus* and the dogmatician are intolerant, it is not the intolerance of revelation."¹⁰

Formulated in such general terms, Bultmann's statements are to some extent open to misunderstanding. A more concrete formulation (undoubtedly in accordance with their author's own intention) would bring out the fact that what we have here is not a general ideology of revelation but a witness to Christ. Taken in this sense, Bultmann's main distinction seems to me a most important one. Tolerance

⁸ H. Gollwitzer, art. "Toleranz" in the *Evang. Kirchenlexikon*, 4th ed. Stuttgart 1963, col. 1247.

⁹ R. Ullmann in his little booklet, *Tolerance and Intolerable*, p. 6. In another context, H. Marcuse asserts that "the telos of tolerance is truth" (*Kritik der reinen Toleranz*, Frankfurt/Main 1967, p. 102). Marcuse's criticism of "pure" tolerance, i.e., one which neutralizes all differences and decisions and therefore glorifies the *status quo* in society, provides food for thought. He sounds too dogmatic, however, when he offers as a general principle his positive directive: "A liberating tolerance, therefore, would mean being intolerant of right-wing movements and indulgent towards left-wing movements" (*op. cit.*, p. 120).

¹⁰ Rudolf Bultmann, *Das Evangelium des Johannes*, 1941, p. 288.

towards the fellow human being does not exclude a serious and binding decision of faith and belief (and, in this sense, "intolerance" in the matter of truth, or, better still, zeal for truth), nor, conversely, does such a decision of faith exclude tolerance towards the fellow human being. Where this distinction is *not* made, where tolerance towards the fellow human being leads us to relativize the question of truth, or where, on the contrary, the zeal of our commitment to truth is prolonged to include intolerance towards our neighbor, then the biblical understanding both of truth and tolerance is distorted and misrepresented. Only in the tension between unconditional obligation to the truth known and confessed, and, on the other hand, a sympathetic receptivity to and solidarity with those who think differently—who surely "stand or fall" to their own Lord (and not to us!)—can we be faithful to the witness to Christ.

The effort to define the relation between zeal for "truth" and "tolerance" responsibly in the light of the biblical witness, therefore, is always a struggle on two fronts. It is a struggle, on the one hand, against the temptation to employ coercive and dictatorial means in order to eke out the witness to truth (even with the best of intentions and in the service of the most benign ends) and, on the other hand, against the temptation to interpret and practice toleration as if it dispensed us individually and socially from decision and commitment in the matter of truth and, if we are Christians, in witness to Christ as the truth. Stated positively, zeal for truth and tolerance go together. They can and should be mutually related. We have to live with, respect, and work crea-

tively with the tension inherent in our theme; and do so in order to safeguard both terms from misinterpretation and misuse. For, to paraphrase a dictum of Immanuel Kant's, without tolerance, zeal for truth is blind: without zeal for truth, tolerance is empty.

Blind zeal and spiritual emptiness—these are the two sicknesses which, if not "unto death" (Kierkegaard), are certainly conditions serious and critical enough to endanger human life—individual and social—even and perhaps especially in affluent societies. Latently, of course, these two dangers are present in every individual and social situation. Depending on the particular circumstances, however, one or the other danger may, of course, predominate and represent the greater temptation. Am I mistaken in feeling that it is the struggle on the second front which is especially relevant today in the climate and conditions prevailing in western pluralistic society—in the Swiss church and society, for example? Namely, the struggle against the temptation to think of tolerance as exempting us from decision and commitment in the matter of truth?

To avoid any misunderstanding here, let me emphasize that in no way do I minimize the first of these two dangers, that of individual and collective intolerance. How could I possibly do so in view of my firsthand experience over many years of conditions in which civil and religious liberty was under constant threat and one had to wrestle day in and day out with an ideology and power politics which used every conceivable means to establish its "truth" by intimidating and excluding other options? Even in the West, it is impossible for me to ignore tendencies to intolerance, though

here, of course, such tendencies are very diffuse in character. There are temptations of militant and self-righteous mentality and strategy even in our churches, particularly, though not exclusively, on the extreme right wing of the theological and political spectrum. Such tendencies and temptations have to be opposed and counteracted.

However, if we think of the spiritual climate in our academic communities, is not the insidious growth of indifference in religious, ethical, and political matters an even more acute danger? A pluralism which is not just the acceptance of a legitimate plurality of views in an open society but an ideology of non-commitment, a "world-view" founded on the renunciation of decision and involvement? A permissiveness which not only advocates greater sympathy for nonconformists and nonconformist lifestyles (in itself a perfectly legitimate position) but one which also questions every norm and obligation and permits all the flowers of morality—past and present—to blossom, even (and with special gusto) the more unsavory varieties? A freedom interested mainly in negation, in demolishing restrictions and limitations, a freedom which neglects the positive fulfillment of our obligations towards our fellow human beings and which is therefore in danger of disappearing in a bottomless and endless void? . . . Would these not constitute symptoms of a wasting disease in the life of society and the church, inevitably provoking people—especially young people—who are looking for meaning to their lives, to a passionate protest and to desperate attempts to give meaning to political and religious life?

My use of the subjunctive mood of questioning here in preference to the categorical indicative of affirmative theses is deliberate. None of the points just made is to be taken as a blanket condemnation but rather as an account of experience. Perhaps, too, as an indication of the reason why, for some of those who make it, the transition from the East to the West is not only a liberating experience (this it certainly is above all and in spite of everything!) but also, to some extent, a depressing one, especially for those concerned for what Luther called "the freedom of the Christian."

Here, I believe, is the context of the special task of theology and church. In one of the later volumes of his *Church Dogmatics* (in his calm old age, therefore, and not in his "angry 'storm and stress' period"), Karl Barth wrote: "An existence with no horizon, contour, or shape, one exposed on all sides and therefore at the mercy of every wind that blows, an existence which is consequently the prey to dissolution and disintegration, is a thing of the past for the Christian. The pride and the misery of boundless opining, thinking, and striving is over and done with."¹¹ The fact is that freedom in the Christian sense, just because it is the freedom made accessible in the history of Christ, also has to reflect the characteristic features of that history. Since freedom in the case of Jesus is a freedom which springs from non-coersive love, these features of freedom in the Christian sense include non-coersive patient tolerance of and readiness for dialogue even with "dif-

¹¹ Karl Barth, *Kirchliche Dogmatik* IV/3, Zürich 1959, p. 762. Cf. *ET Church Dogmatics* IV/3, Edinburgh, p. 665.

ficult" contemporaries. At the same time, however, they also include zeal for truth, efforts to introduce the clearly defined impulses of the "Good News" into the behavior patterns and conditions of our time. In my view, few things are more otiose and boring than a theology and theologians, sermons and preachers, who no longer take risks for the truth committed to them but, in conformity to the mood of our time, hide this truth, this "light," "under a bushel," shrouding it in the twilight of relativism. Jesus had an apt formula for this behavior. He called it "savorless salt" (Matthew 5:13; Luther's translation here is "dummen Salz"—"stupid or rubbishy salt"). But for their fermentation processes, our church and our society need the salt of truth, concretely, the salt of Jesus. *This* salt must not lose its savor—through our lukewarmness and laziness.

III

Let me conclude these thoughts on a personal note. In the academic year 1947-48, I was a foreign student in Basle, Switzerland. This was a memorable year in one of the peak periods of the university there, the beginning of its so-called *Carolingian Era*—the period of the "two Karls"—Karl Barth and Karl Jaspers. The latter had just begun to teach in Basle. I attended the courses of both teachers diligently and with fascination. It was not long, however, before I felt a certain resultant tension, the nub of which could be summed up fairly accurately in terms of our theme: "zeal for truth, and tolerance." Certainly both teachers were exponents of both these terms—yet each in his own distinctive way and with different emphases. In the teach-

ing of Karl Barth we were introduced to an impressively and comprehensively sustained "christological concentration," to a movement of thought which emphasized that "if it is to be worthy of the name and to edify the Christian Church in the world, Christian doctrine must be, in all its statements, exclusively and consistently, directly or indirectly, doctrine of Jesus Christ as the living Word of God addressed to us."¹²

The intellectual world to which we were introduced by the teaching of Karl Jaspers had quite a different structure. Even here, of course, we were lifted into an argument of faith, a philosophical faith. This faith showed great understanding for fundamental themes of the biblical tradition. Without the Bible, Jaspers told us, we in the West slide back into the void, deprived of our human and philosophical roots. The philosopher's openness to biblical thinking, however, halted at a certain point; the point namely where it claimed that "there is salvation in no one else." Again and again, Jaspers reached for strong words to express his opposition at this point: "Both in its motivation and in its consequences, this claim is disastrous for us human beings. We must struggle for the truth and for our souls against this fatal claim."¹³

In subsequent years, living in a Marxist-Leninist society, I had frequent occasion to reflect on these two positions and to test their relative strength in critical situations. Global judgments are to be avoided in either case. I make no secret of the fact that

¹² "How my mind has changed," in *Christian Century*, 20/9/1939.

¹³ Karl Jaspers, *Der philosophische Glaube*, 6th ed. Munich 1974, p. 69.

for me personally, as for many of my fellow Christians then, Barth's theology, with its focus on the liberating heart of the Gospel, proved its worth and helped to point us in the right direction. On this basis, it proved possible to continue building up the Christian community even amid the ruins of an era and in an officially atheistic society.

With their impressive liberality, Jaspers' ideas seemed almost dream-like in comparison—almost too beautiful to be true behind the drawn curtains of the Stalinist era. Yet I could never forget the philosopher's warning voice, the less so as day by day we were confronted with the pressures of an absolutized ideology too painfully to let us ever underestimate the dangers of every claim to absoluteness. Jaspers' analysis of the exclusivity syndrome continued to be extremely relevant—even and above all as a challenging question to us as theologians.

In our zeal for truth, where do we stand on tolerance? If our theological zeal for truth makes us unwilling to listen to these questions and work at them in a self-critical spirit, this zeal for truth will all too easily turn into that blind "zeal without knowledge" against which the apostle warns us. We have to be careful to avoid not only the Scylla of non-commitment in the matter of truth but also the Charybdis of intolerance. The little ship of theology and the Church must be steered safely along the narrow course between the rock of an intolerant zeal for truth, on the one side, and the whirlpool of a tolerance without zeal for truth, on the other.

It is my prayerful wish that the Princeton Theological Seminary might continue to guide many of us on that narrow way helping to strengthen the spiritual presuppositions of our Christian ministry: in its zeal for truth and tolerance.

Educating for the Ministry Today

by KAROLY TOTTH

The Right Reverend Dr. Karoly Toth is a native of Hungary and has been a bishop of the Hungarian Reformed Church since 1977. He has served as a Vice-President of the World Alliance of Reformed Churches, and is presently President of the Christian Peace Conference. Dr. Toth is the author of several books, including Living as a Christian in Today's World.

LET me at the outset express my genuine gratitude for the invitation to be present at this solemn and important occasion at Princeton Theological Seminary. I consider this a great honor and a privilege. On behalf of the Synod of the Reformed Church in Hungary, I convey to you warm and cordial greetings. I had the honor of presenting the special message to this significant event at Princeton sent by the President of the Synod of the Hungarian Reformed Church, Dr. Tibor Bartha, to the inaugural committee. Together with the church leadership, alumni of Princeton Theological Seminary in Hungary remember Princeton in their special prayers today. They give thanks to God for the manifold spiritual gifts they received here as students. It is a known fact that the fraternal ties were greatly strengthened during the presidency of Professor Dr. James McCord who had a special place in his heart for the Hungarian Reformed people. We trust that this same traditional, fraternal relationship will continue to grow in the future.

We wish God's blessings on the new president, Dr. Gillespie, as he takes on the responsibility of the office and the work of the presidency. With prayerful hope we look to a great future for the seminary. I express the blessing in the words of the Psalmist: "Peace be within thy walls, and pros-

perity within thy palaces! For my brethren and companions' sake I will now say, Peace be within thee! Because of the house of the Lord our God, I will seek thy good" (Psalm 122:8-9).

Dear sisters and brothers, the subject which has been given to me is "Educating for the Ministry Today," focusing especially on its European and worldwide aspects. Within the limited time I can only reflect on a few of the areas of this important and very complex theme. What I present will necessarily reflect my Hungarian and ecumenical experiences as related to the education for ministry.

The formulation of the theme is self-explanatory and reflects the Calvinistic Presbyterian ecclesiology. It means that theological education is not recognized merely as an academic or intellectual adventure. Education for ministry can have only one objective, that is, to provide servants for the church. This theological truth can be expressed in the sense that education for ministry cannot be divorced from the whole people of God of whom the Heidelberg Catechism rightly states in response to the question: "What do you believe concerning the Holy Catholic Church?—I believe that from the beginning to the end of the world and among the whole human race, the Son of God by His Spirit and His Word gathers, protects, and preserves

for Himself in the unity of the faith a congregation chosen for eternal life. Moreover, I believe, that I am and for ever will remain a living member of it."

It means that it is only in the context of the whole people of God, that is, the church, that the education for ministry can fruitfully take place. The church relatedness of education for ministry operates on the theological principle of the priesthood of all believers. And as the Apostle Peter so clearly states, "But ye are a chosen generation, a royal priesthood, a holy nation, a peculiar people, that ye should show forth the praises of Him who has called you out of darkness into His marvelous light." This points out adequately that there is no priestly order, and no distinction exists between lay and cleric. There only exist different *charismas*, different spiritual gifts within the community of the people of God.

We are aware that Calvin distinguished four such special spiritual gifts. First, the gift of communicating the gospel. Second, the gift of teaching. The third is the gift of serving, and the fourth is the gift of guiding. Those who are endowed with these gifts need to be especially educated to serve the entire community of the people of God. Candidates who are selected for the ministry should manifest signs of their internal and external calling, with these signs being recognized by the people of God. The internal calling is revealed in obedience, and this is faith, while the external signs of those called to the ministry are the readiness and ability to acquire the necessary knowledge. Of these preconditions for the ministry belonging to the people of God, faith and the readiness to learn are indispensable ingredients (*conditio*

sine que non) for the ministry. These requirements should, however, be regarded as potential gifts which ought to be developed through education for ministry by employing the good method of the Calvinistic dialectic which can bring forth the truth by opposing seemingly contradictory yet complementary realities. Education for ministry should be, first, confessional and ecumenical. In the second place, contextual and global. Third, intellectual and spiritual. And fourth, theoretical and practical. All these realities should conform within a single framework.

Let us briefly consider these dialectic requirements in the education for ministry.

Confessional and Ecumenical

Education for ministry was until recently, by definition, confessional; at least this has been the case in Europe. There were, and there still are, the confessional churches which maintained institutions or university faculties for training, but their theological teaching was separate and had little or no bearing on church life. Confessionalism in Europe, with the separation of the teaching from the churches, is unfortunately still a reality in many places. Confessionalism is hard to define, as it is an amalgam of diverse elements, historical, social, psychological, and cultural. Belonging to a confessional church gives the particular Christian his or her identity. Confessional identity, even in our ecumenical age, can be legitimate in that it preserves theological and spiritual values expressing the faith according to historical and cultural conditions unique to people living in an area. Confessionalism becomes illegitimate when it regards other expressions of

faith in negative terms while making an idol of its own confession, and this can only be avoided by being open to dialogue with other confessions.

The ecumenical dimension means the readiness to experience and take account of other confessions of the one and the same Christian faith. The ecumenical approach is also soteriological and missionary. Salvation is meant for all human beings. Ecumenicity also means a joint response to the challenges of the contemporary world. Information should be distributed about other churches and traditions and even about other religions. This is the reason why the exchange of students between Hungary and Princeton has proved so productive. It is with great joy that we can state that it is no longer a one-way communication, since in recent years, students from Princeton have attended Hungarian seminaries.

Contextual and Global

Second, education for ministry should be simultaneously contextual and global. It should not be divorced from realities of country and areas. Those who are preparing for the ministry should be aware of the happenings in the social, political, economic, and cultural life. Education for ministry has to be rooted in reality, leading to questioning that same reality in the name of other realities and in the name of the expected reality, the kingdom of God.

Education for ministry must be global, in that it should train candidates to be responsible for the whole earth and all of mankind. The church of Jesus Christ is in great need of ministers conscious of global problems who are ready and able to lead the churches away from isolation. It is here that

education for peace, justice, and social responsibility rightly belongs. Witnessing to peace and justice is an ecumenical and global task: a response to the challenge to save the world which is on the brink of a nuclear catastrophe.

Intellectual and Spiritual

Third, education for ministry must be both intellectual and spiritual. An ever present temptation, especially for Protestant churches, is to equate faith with intellectual knowledge. No doubt the ministry requires great intellectual preparedness and effort, while at the same time, it demands genuine Christian spirituality which expresses itself in prayer, meditation, self-discipline, and sensitivity—to be able to rejoice with those who rejoice and weep with those who weep. Without this developed gift of spirituality, no servant of God can effectively exercise pastoral care worthy of the name. At this point, the Presbyterian Calvinistic type of education for ministry has to be self-critical. For our education for ministry still depends largely on the ancient, rationalistic, and erroneous notion that knowledge of God is an intellectual attempt to an understanding as to who He is, rather than living our lives in obedience to Him. We teach the Christian life as doctrine and train pastors to be amateur theologians. In the Bible, education and ministry are not merely the spreading of intellectual knowledge but a calling to live the truth—that is, the communication of faith in action.

Theoretical and Practical

Fourth, education for ministry should be both theoretical and practical. The problem is that the educa-

tion that we impart oscillates between academic theology and practical formation, university theology and seminary theology. However, it must be stated clearly that these are the two sides of the same coin. There are only functional differences because both theological research and the practical formation of future ministers should serve the witness of the *una sancta ecclesia*—the one holy catholic church.

In conclusion, education for ministry should be church-related. It should be regarded as a process of intellectual and spiritual development. Thus, education for ministry should be con-

ceived and practiced in relation to the whole people of God. The main requirements for such a service are, faith in a triune God on the basis of a personal commitment and acquisition of adequate and appropriate knowledge. A minister should be equipped intellectually and endowed spiritually.

All of these conditions must be understood as high standards to be met by the educators and educated alike, "as servants not as man pleases, but as the servants of Christ doing the will of God from the heart" (Ephesians 6:6), as the Apostle Paul teaches in his Epistle to the Ephesians.

Educating Ministers for the New Presbyterian Church

by C. ELLIS NELSON

Dr. C. Ellis Nelson is the interim president of Austin Theological Seminary. He has served as president and professor of Christian education at Louisville Presbyterian Seminary and as dean and professor of Christian education at Union Theological Seminary.

WHEN President-elect Thomas Gillespie invited me to speak at this pre-inaugural dinner for the board of trustees, faculty, and guests of Princeton Seminary, I wondered what use to make of this time.

Should I use this time to discuss the role of the seminaries in the life of the denomination? This question engaged my attention, for the role and the function of seminaries are not well understood by lay people or by many administrators in our denomination. Should I attempt to show the value of theological education for our national well-being? This is a topic that is seldom examined. We get so involved in the day-to-day problems of the seminary and of the churches that we seldom step aside to see how important our work is for our country's common life.

Finally, I came to believe that the best use of our time would be to analyze one of our most difficult and longstanding problems in theological education and to propose a solution which goes beyond the domain of any one seminary. This seems appropriate at this point in history, for we are forming a new denomination out of the former United Presbyterian Church and the Presbyterian Church U.S. Perhaps a new denomination with ten theological seminaries can take a fresh look at the problem and can experiment with a solution.

The Problem

The most challenging problem in theological education is providing an educational experience which will help ministers practice ministry within the context of a sound theology.

It may be helpful to state the problem in several ways. One way is to identify the first three to five years of practice after ordination as the crucial years for establishing a minister's identity, style of leadership, and habits of work. Ministers are not a special case in this regard: lawyers, doctors, and other professional people have the same problem. What is different is that most other professions have guidelines for professional practice which are clear enough to shape persons as they enter that vocation—clear enough, for example, so that doctors or lawyers can be sued for malpractice if they do not conform to those professional guidelines. The ministry does not have such clear guidelines for professional practice. In fact, when persons enter their first congregations as ministers, they often find the congregations' role expectations to be different from what they expected or for which they were trained. Inexperienced ministers, unless in a staff position with other ministers, must begin the practice of ministry with little guidance or supervision. Occasionally one hears of a presbytery that offers

some help to ministers in their first pastorate. I will comment on that later. These exceptions prove the rule that presbyteries are seldom set up to provide this kind of educational experience. What inexperienced ministers work out in those first few years sets the style and substance of their whole career.

The problem is often described in another way which goes like this. The seminary is modeled after graduate schools, for practically all seminary professors come from such institutions. The seminaries want to contribute to the thought-life of the church; so they encourage professors to write, to do research, and to lecture. They support "loving God with the mind" through sabbatical leaves and expense money for professors to participate in, and write scholarly articles for, their academic guild. Several of our seminaries also publish journals of a scholarly nature to help establish themselves as academic centers for the church. All of this is good and necessary. Presbyterian roots are still in the sixteenth century Reformation, where scholarship was the principle weapon of protest that established a new era for Western civilization. Moreover, the theology of the Reformation asserts that we have nothing to fear and much to gain from all forms of knowledge about human nature and the physical world.

However, in this situation the seminary becomes a sanctuary for scholarship about the sacred. The role model is the learned professor. Most professors are ordained ministers and many of them relate their academic subjects to the practice of ministry; but they do so in the state of mind and in the

setting which is arranged for acquiring mental mastery of a subject. In this sense the seminary is like a greenhouse: all of the environment—including the calendar—is controlled for the maximum learning in a classroom setting. After ordination, students find themselves in a setting unlike the place where they were trained. The congregation has its own authority, folkways, and internal power struggles. It often *represents* American culture more than it *presents* a struggle to understand God's will for the world. This "operating theology" of congregations has deep roots in the emotional makeup of the people; therefore, it is not changed by classroom methods learned in the seminary. The ordinary person's theology will seldom be changed by intellectual exercises; it will only be changed when these people have jolting life experiences which cause them to re-examine their basic assumptions. Such re-examination must be done in close association with the jolting events, and this re-examination cannot be scheduled.

Thus, newly ordained ministers find themselves in an environment different from that of their training, with people who have different theological assumptions, living on an unsystematic theological time schedule, and impatient with history and logical analysis. Far, far too many young ministers simply adjust to the realities of the congregation and the immediate life problems of their parishioners; they select from their theological training what has utilitarian value and let the rest go. We all know exceptions to this general pattern, but the number of young ministers who are able to think theologically about their min-

istry and carry that process through in all of their work is quite small.

The difference between underlying assumptions about life found in congregations and those found in seminaries is enough to account for the majority of newly ordained ministers working out their own accommodation to the role they are expected to play. But our sympathies should also include the magnitude of mental challenge facing young ministers. For example, educators have worked out a taxonomy of cognitive activity. The lowest level of knowing is the ability to recall information. Levels of cognition go up to a sixth stage—the ability to make judgments. This highest level requires knowledge, experience, and an ability to bring all of this together in a judgment. Newly ordained ministers are thrust into congregations where they must immediately function at the highest cognitive level of judgment for which they have had little or no training in the seminary situation where they were in a passive relation to theological authority.

This observation leads to a third way to describe the basic problem. In the last decade or so, some theologians have become more and more insistent that theology must not be something worked out by the mind and then applied to life. The sharp separation of theology from life is what caused seminaries in the nineteenth century to establish chairs of “practical theology” and thus institutionalize the problem I have been describing. Edward Farley has traced the history of this theological situation in his book *Theologia*. The book is analytical and is so abstract that one cannot easily formulate educational reforms—at

least, seminary curricular changes—based on his work. But Farley’s main argument is clear: theological education prior to the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries was guided by a theology considered to consist of beliefs about faith and about God. There was no “practical theology,” for theology embraced all of life and theologians were in a dialectical relationship to life situations. For example, John Calvin would not have considered himself a “practical” theologian when he started his Academy in 1559, nor would he have sent for an “educator” to set up and manage the school. To Calvin, theology embraced all aspects of life; and when he saw the need for a school, he founded one and taught in it. In like manner, when Augustine received a letter from a friend asking for a brief summary of Christian beliefs for lay people, he did not send the request to a “practical” theologian; he sat down and wrote a seventy-five page paper which today we would call a curriculum for young adults (*Enchiridion*, about 421 A.D.).

Farley wants to restore the original idea of theology as “sapiential knowledge which attended salvation” (p. 81). Theology so defined is wisdom about God which undergirds and permeates all of life. Communicating theology in that sense is built into life as a habit and is communicated as a way of life—the form of education which in classical Greece was called *paideia* (pp. 152-156; 170-171). Having made this point, Farley concludes his study with some general suggestions to theological educators but proposes no plans.

We are left, then, with the problem. The practice of ministry becomes set in the first three to five years after leaving seminary. Young ministers

have to work out their practice in a setting different from that in which they were trained, where the conception of theology too often is related to subjects taught rather than to a habit of thinking that meets God in life situations.

American Background

I want to propose a solution to this problem or at least a way to work on a solution. It would be helpful to realize that what I have said so far about the basic problem in educating ministers is rooted in our history. Robert Lynn and his team of researchers have been carefully documenting the education of American ministers. They have shown that in the colonial period prospective ministers obtained their basic academic training in colleges founded—as Harvard was—by denominations in order to supply a learned ministry. After finishing college the candidates then attached themselves to experienced ministers for a while, often living in their homes, until they had acquired the ability and self-confidence to be ordained. This is effective *paideia*. These young ministers simply absorbed into their whole being theology as a habit of mind ruling one's piety, family life, preaching, and congregational and community leadership. The seminary era began, according to Lynn, when Harvard called a Unitarian as professor of theology and a few years later a president who was also a Unitarian. In reaction, Eliphalet Pearson gathered a group of supporters and founded the first freestanding seminary at Andover, Massachusetts, in 1808. Andover Seminary was self-conscious about its mission, was separate from collegiate education, had its own faculty, had a

three-year curriculum, a library, and a board of directors. Princeton Seminary followed in 1812, and the pattern of freestanding seminaries spread rapidly and became the standard way to train ministers. Thus, seminaries are an American development rooted in our history and founded to secure the beliefs of denominations. However, by institutionalizing ministerial training, seminaries created the problems we are discussing. According to Lynn, there were complaints from the beginning that seminary graduates had too much academic knowledge and not enough ability to serve the needs of people in the churches. This criticism became more intense in the 1870-1920 period when seminaries increasingly became like higher educational institutions. They called professors who had research degrees (often from German universities), began to train specialists in certain subjects, introduced elective courses, and started to grant degrees. When the newly created Association of Theological Schools adopted accreditation standards in 1936, the seduction of seminaries into academia was settled. Since that time, the tension in seminaries—especially denominational ones—has been between the demands of scholarship as defined by graduate schools and the needs of the churches.

I am tempted to pause here and explain why the seminaries moved toward accreditation and thus closer to the canons of judgments prevailing in the universities. It would take too long to discuss this matter in detail, but I want to show my sympathies for the seminaries by noting that the knowledge explosion is not a recent phenomenon. Ideas—really new ideas—such as those introduced by Charles

Darwin, Karl Marx, Sigmund Freud, and Alfred North Whitehead, have burst upon us in rapid succession for over a hundred years. The ideas these four people introduced shattered previous basic assumptions about life; and Christian thinkers had to work through these ideas from the standpoint of our faith in Jesus Christ. If our seminary professors had not given their best thoughts to these and other developments of the mind, our churches would be floundering in an intellectual backwater—unable to guide modern people trained in modern knowledge. Moreover, we really cannot fault the seminaries for dealing with the enormous expansion of knowledge as the universities did by encouraging our professors to specialize in restricted areas, emphasize research, and set a curriculum based on elective courses, because no other alternative was proposed or tested.

Seminary Response

Leaders in our seminaries have long been conscious of the need to bridge the gap between theology as intellectual work and theology which helps ministers respond to the life situations of their parishioners. As indicated earlier, the seminaries in the latter part of the nineteenth century established chairs of practical theology. Many of the professors who were called to those chairs were well-known pastors or preachers who lectured out of their experience. Or, the seminaries sponsored lectures on practical subjects as Yale Divinity School did in 1888 when it invited H. Clay Trumbull to give the Lyman Beecher Lectures on "The Sunday School." After World War I, supervised field work was introduced into the seminaries by professors who

were influenced by the way social workers were trained. In the early 1940s pastoral counseling moved rapidly into clinical teaching methods inspired by medical education. Since then, clinical pastoral education has established itself both inside and outside the seminaries. In the 1960s efforts were made to upgrade field work to field education, and several promising experiments were conducted. In the 1970s efforts were made to further upgrade field education to the supervised practice of ministry.

During the last fifty years some denominations have required that each ministerial candidate have one full year as an intern before ordination in order to insure some practical experience. Seminaries have also responded in recent decades with an array of continuing education courses. These, too, have been helpful for ministers to fill in the blank spots in their training or to update their knowledge of theology. But, being short-termed, continuing education courses cannot delve into the way individual ministers deal with their practice. The Doctor of Ministry degree is better as post-ordination training, for in most cases ministers are required to relate some practice of ministry to their theology. Moreover, D.Min. programs usually require a term of service as a minister before one can enter them; however, only a small percentage of our ministers enroll in such a program.

For the past forty years I have participated in almost all of these efforts to improve the practice of ministry. I am now ready to say that, although these efforts to solve the basic problem were helpful and in some cases effective, we have not yet found a satisfactory way to inform practice with

theology. Students who have been out of seminary for a few years continue to tell us this is so. Every year at the General Assembly we have ten to twenty proposals to improve theological education in the form of overtures or suggestions from the standing committee. Almost without exception, these suggestions assume that seminaries can teach students all they should know before they graduate or that the addition of an elective course will serve the particular need they have in mind. This is sad, for it comes out of a misconception as to what seminaries can do and as to the nature of theological education.

A Proposal

Starting a new denomination with ten theological seminaries provides the occasion for us to propose a solution to the basic problem of preparing persons for the practice of ministry. I do not have time in this speech to work through all the details, so I will only outline a proposal.

The ten seminaries should begin the subtle but constructive task of thinking of themselves as charged with a common task. One of the first things they should say in their publications and in their interactions with churches is that seminaries can do no more than prepare a person for ordination and provide an introduction to the practice of ministry. This would help everyone understand the limitations of seminary training. The seminaries are doing all they can in three years or—in some cases—three years and a summer for biblical language.

The second thing the ten seminaries should do is to appoint a committee to discuss the problem of how theology can be understood in relation to

the practice of ministry and the possibility of using the three years after ordination to help establish this theology as a habit of the mind. From that discussion, some or all of the seminaries may be interested in sponsoring an experiment. I am reasonably confident that three or four of the seminaries would be ready to form an alliance to test a proposal. That may be the best way to proceed, for some seminaries may not be ready and others may be too involved in their own programs at this time. But I would hope that all ten would be willing to participate in planning and monitoring an experiment even if some of the ten were not in the position to participate directly.

Third, the cluster of seminaries interested in an experiment should then negotiate with a presbytery or a group of presbyteries to jointly sponsor an experiment for newly ordained ministers. In order to learn from such an educational experience the number of experimental places should be kept to three or four. Although the basic problem and the proposed educational experience is the same in each place, some differences should be encouraged in order to test the effectiveness of different procedures.

The planning, sponsorship, and funding must be shared by the seminaries and presbyteries. This is the *only* way it will be "owned" by the two agencies *directly responsible* for the training and supervision of ministers. If this experiment is turned over to an Assembly agency, it will be removed from the arena in which it must function and will become prey for all of the special groups which illustrate the problem that the experiment is trying to solve. Moreover, if some plan

emerges from the experiment which becomes normative for newly ordained ministers, it may change some of the work of presbyteries and it may require the seminaries to provide persons for their part of the plan with training and skills different from those expected of professors. If this happens, as I think it will, the presbyteries and seminaries need to discover that for themselves and not have a third party explain it to them.

It is also important to keep this as an *experiment* until the seminaries and presbyteries are confident that they have achieved a workable solution. The educational landscape is littered with proposals which looked good, were tried, and were abandoned because they started off in a "big bang" of creativity without providing ways of correcting themselves as they went along. It is crucial that any three-year, post-ordination educational plan be carefully monitored and that a process of correction and change be built into the experiment. It is also important that such a plan not be expanded beyond a few places until we know the qualities needed in the persons who manage the work and how those qualities can be inculcated in an expanding core of leaders.

Beyond Analysis

The procedures I have proposed assume that the seminaries are doing all they can with three or three and a half years. A different educational experience is necessary for a more advanced practice of ministry.

I should leave the matter alone at this point and see if enough interest is generated to start a planning process. However, I would like to share what I would say if I were involved

in the planning of such an experiment. I would start with what I saw in Susquehanna Valley Presbytery a few years ago. A small group of newly ordained ministers found themselves in this presbytery facing the basic problem I have described in this paper. They took hold of their educational needs by meeting on Thursdays for corporate exegesis of a predetermined biblical passage. After having written sermons based on the studied passage and having preached them to their congregations, they critiqued each others' sermons. Needing more help, they applied to Auburn Theological Seminary for a grant to engage a professor of speech and homiletics to listen to them in their own congregations. Later they engaged a counselor to go over their counseling cases and explore what they and their congregations could do in each particular case. Let me hasten to say these newly ordained ministers were graduates of one of our best theological seminaries and one was completing a Ph.D. in Old Testament. Because they had good basic theological training and were unusually alert to the problems of entering the ministry, they were determined to get the training needed for the congregations they were called to serve. After a few years the program they set up was so well received that the presbytery began to supply funds to keep it going. Somewhere in the Susquehanna Valley Presbytery experience, and perhaps in what other presbyteries have done, there is the beginning of a plan.

This educational experience is different from that which takes place in a seminary. It is different because the learners are ministers and therefore are accountable to themselves, to their

congregations, and to their peers in presbytery for the way they respond to the events that happen in their congregations. The goal is the development of a theology which will become a habit of ministers' minds as they deal with the mission of the churches they serve. When that happens, then

our ministers will be able to respond to all life situations: the handicapped, children's needs, young people's problems, adult stages of life, evil, good, social justice, evangelism, and everything else people experience within the congregational / community context where ministry is practiced.

The Concept of Order in Theology and Science

by THOMAS F. TORRANCE

Dr. Thomas F. Torrance is professor of Christian dogmatics, emeritus, New College, Edinburgh, Scotland. He is the recipient of the 1978 Templeton Prize for Progress in Religion. A renowned teacher and author, Dr. Torrance has pioneered in his work on the dialogue between Christian theology and science.

ALL rational knowledge has to do with order, in developing an orderly account of the way in which things actually are in their own inherent structure or intelligibility. If they were not orderly in themselves they would not be intelligible to us and would not be open to rational description and explanation. Broadly speaking, then, we are accustomed to equate the orderly with the rational, and the disorderly with the irrational or at least the non-rational. It should be noted right away, however, as Alastair McKinnon has shown so clearly, that order is not something that we can ever prove, for we have to assume order in any attempt at proof or disproof. That is to say, order presupposes an ultimate ground of order, with which we operate at the back of our mind in all rational activity. Belief in order, the conviction that, whatever may appear to the contrary in so-called random or chance events, reality is intrinsically orderly, constitutes one of the ultimate controlling factors in all rational and scientific activity. The same belief in order, together with a refusal to accept the possibility of an ultimate fortuitousness behind the universe, lies deeply embedded in religious consciousness. Where is that more powerfully expressed than in the anguished cries of the Old Testament Psalmists whose faith in the truth, righteousness, and steadfast love of God

remains finally unshaken in spite of being desperately baffled by the frequent triumph of evil in the world?

Thus both the scientific and the religious approaches to states of affairs that defy rational explanation do not make us abandon our belief in order. They point us to an ultimate ground of order both as a sufficient reason for our compulsive belief in order and as a controlling center of reference for a scientific or a theological interpretation of what would otherwise appear quite disorderly and irrational. This ultimate ground of order is and must be hidden, for in the nature of the case it cannot be conceptualized, far less explained, in terms of the orderly arrangement of things within the universe that is indebted to it. In a strange way it is known only in not being known, or known only in an implicit or subsidiary way as the comprehensive presupposition for the understanding of any or all order whatsoever. Without it everything would finally be meaningless and pointless.

It is the argument of the discussion that follows, however, that science and theology are each dedicated in their own way, not only to clarifying and understanding order, but to achieving order, not only to probing into and disclosing the order of things as they actually are, but the actualizing or realizing of order in our interaction with nature and with one another. That is

to say, in theology and science alike, we are concerned with the *kind of order that ought to be*, through relating actual order to the ultimate controlling ground of order from which all order proceeds.

Let us first consider *theology*.

The belief in order, with which we have so much to do in Christian life and thought, has its ground in the *Love of God*, for it is ultimately God's Love which is the power of order in created existence. Here we are concerned not only with belief in the order inherent in the empirical universe as it becomes disclosed to us through our scientific inquiries, but with the *kind of order that ought to be* actualized within the universe, for that is the law of God's Love for the universe.

God *is* Love, for Love is the self-determining form of God's Being within himself as God, and therefore also the determining basis of all reality other than God and contingent upon him. This does not mean that God is necessarily related to the world, for it was out of his overwhelming, overflowing love that he freely and ungrudgingly brought the world into being, giving it a genuine reality of its own though utterly differentiated from himself. Moreover, he continues freely and ungrudgingly to sustain it in being through relation to himself, thereby constituting himself in his Love as its true determining end. God is the only One who is what he does and does what he is, so that the very Love that God eternally is in himself and in his relation to the universe he has made bears in a commanding ontological way upon it. That is the ultimate ground for its commanding ground which is as such the ultimate judge of all disorder and evil wher-

ever it may arise. That is why in the Old Testament, for example, the majestic I AM of God is revealed as the one ground upon which all the prohibitions in the Decalogue rest, disorderly ways of behavior being the very antithesis of what God is, and why the commandment to love our neighbor as ourselves is intrinsically bound up with the supreme commandment to love the Lord our God with all our heart, and all our soul, and all our mind, and with all our strength, as Jesus reiterated in the Gospel. The kind of order that ought to be realized in the world is the law of God's Love.

This is the concept of order which Christian theology seeks to think out by relating the Incarnation of the Word of God in Jesus Christ to the creation which was brought into being from nothing through the creative power of that Word. It was thus that the all-important concept of *contingent intelligibility* originally arose in Western thought, as the Christian doctrine of the Incarnation had the effect of overthrowing the Greek notions of the unreality of matter and the divine nature of the rational forms immanent in the world. That did not take place all at once, by any manner of means, for while the decisive, revolutionizing concepts injected into the stream of human culture had a radical effect at the time, they have had to struggle ever since with the persistence in our Western mind of pre-Christian forms of thought which have come down to us with an immense prestige due to the magnificent contribution of ancient Greek to human civilization.

Our task now is to develop this essentially biblical concept of order by relating the creation to the Incarna-

tion from the perspective of its embodiment of the Love of God in Jesus Christ within the spatio-temporal structures of our existence in this world, and therefore in the light of the fact that the overwhelming, commanding Love of God has taken precisely this astonishing way of humiliation, passion, and atoning sacrifice to realize its supreme end within our disordered world. In Jesus Christ the new order of the Kingdom of God's Love has intersected the old order of our existence in this world, with a view to redeeming and liberating it from the forces of disorder and darkness entrenched in it and renewing the whole created order. It is incumbent upon us, therefore, to relate the *actual order* we find in the world to the *redemptive order* which lies at the heart of the Christian message. In the Christian Faith we look for a *new order* in which the *damaged order*, or the disorder that inexplicably arises in the world, will be healed through a creative reordering of existence as it is reconciled to its ultimate ground in the creative Love of God. Hence, far from thinking of the saving acts of God in Jesus Christ as in any way an interruption of the order of creation, or some sort of violation of natural law, we must rather think of the Incarnation, Passion, and Resurrection of Christ, and indeed of his miraculous acts of healing, together with the so-called "nature miracles," all as the chosen way in which God, the ultimate Source of all rational order, brings his transcendent Mind and Will to bear upon the disordered structures of our creaturely existence in space and time. That is the way of his redeeming and commanding love. The kind of order with which we are concerned in Christian

theology, then, is creative and normative, redemptive and regulative, at the same time. It is order fulfilling and expressing the imperative of the overwhelming, unconditional, and liberating Love of God.

Now let us consider *science*.

Science, natural and physical science, is no less dedicated to order, not only to the understanding of order but to the attainment of order. The kind of order that our scientific inquiries disclose is not only that of past states of affairs but that of states of affairs which are constantly emerging and developing. This is nowhere more apparent than in the way in which we are forced to relate all scientific inquiries, and indeed science itself, to the expansion of the universe from its initial dense state and the so-called "primeval soup" toward an increasingly ordered state, in an expansion from order to ever richer and more complex order. This has been greatly reinforced by the rethinking of classical thermodynamics in application to open systems, in which we discover order spontaneously arising far from states of equilibrium where instead of random fluctuations or chaos we find more organized, higher levels of order.

The kind of order that arises in nature in this way is what R. B. Lindsay in a very interesting article has recently called "entropy-consuming," that is, an orderly movement against the dissipation of order. But that is, after all, what science itself is, an entropy-consuming activity, geared into the entropy-consuming activity of nature, and dedicated to the understanding and maintaining of order in face of the "natural" inclination of nature to degenerate into states of disorder—

the sort of thing that every gardener knows only too well! It is in the biological, anthropological, and sociological sciences, in which we study life-processes in various forms, that we find most evident the kind of order that consumes entropy. Indeed an instructive history of human civilization could be written from this very point of view, as the increasing development and cultivation of order in man's interaction with the intelligible universe around him, in the course of which science in various forms plays an essential and supreme role, as an entropy-consuming pursuit. At the same time, of course, achievements of this kind have to pay the penalty of a considerable dissipation of energy, or the transmutation of energy from an available to a non-available form.

It should now be apparent that in natural science we strive to grasp not only how things as a matter of fact are found to be arranged in nature, but how things *ought* to be arranged. In our engagement in scientific activity we respond to an ontological imperative which we share with the whole universe of created reality in its constant expansion toward maximum order. Only relatively few people, of course, are passionately committed to scientific research in unraveling the immanent secrets of nature, but scientific activity after all, as Einstein used to point out, is only a refined form of our normal, rational behavior in the world. Hence it is justifiably to be claimed that the inner compulsion which prompts and drives our science is no more than an extension of the rational compulsion under which we human beings live our daily life.

This inner compulsion is what R. B. Lindsay has called "the thermo-

dynamic imperative" which, in line with the second law of thermodynamics, he defines in these terms: "While we *do* live we ought always to act in all things in such a way as to produce as much order in our environment as possible, in other words to maximize the consumption of entropy." This helps us to appreciate why science is always generating fresh and more sophisticated technologies, ways of transmuting available energy into higher and more complex patterns, through which the inherent forces of nature are encouraged to function in accordance with their own latent potentialities for order. It should be added, however, that this thermodynamic imperative is not to be associated with a masterful ambition in human beings to triumph over nature, or to impose their own egos and wills upon their environment in the most convenient way to serve their interests, although, admittedly, human selfishness and greed do actually lead people to misuse science and technology in just that way.

I believe that we must discern behind this imperative to increase the degree of order, whether in nature or in human life, something much more compelling, a requirement or obligation emanating from the *ultimate ground of all order* and echoed by the claims of created reality upon us. This is the imperative of which we are acutely aware as we tune our minds as faithfully as possible to the intrinsic structures of the universe, for it generates in us what has been called, very appropriately, the *scientific conscience*. In other words, it is an imperative which the scientist *as scientist* cannot in rational conscience disregard or disobey, but to which he is, precisely

as rational scientist, wholly committed. This is what lies at the back of the fact that the order inherent in the universe, which presses ineluctably upon our minds in all inquiry, is a feature of the universe which, as we have already noted, it is impossible to prove but which must be presupposed in all proof: it is the order that provokes and guides our inquiries, on which we rely in all testing of evidence, or in formulating our theories, and to which we appeal in the last resort as the ultimate judge of the truth or falsity of our understanding, concepts, and explanations. It is this ultimate order, the ontic truth of things to which we are rationally committed and over which we have no control, which stands guard over all our scientific inquiries and theories from discovery to verification.

Here let me offer three remarks about the ground we have covered so far.

(1) We have now moved beyond the old idea that natural science is concerned only with the *how* and not with the *why*, that is, with mechanical processes and not with ends, whereas theology is concerned only with *why-questions*, that is, questions about beginnings and ends. That sharp distinction had the effect of importing a deep split between science and theology, and indeed between the natural sciences and the humanities, from which our way of life and thought has suffered severely in the most sensitive areas of human culture. It is now evident, however, that the *how* questions and the *why* questions cannot be finally separated, and that they appear different when they are found linked together. I think here particularly of the place that *time* has come to occupy

at basic points in scientific inquiry and theory, in respect of the age of the universe, the dynamic states of matter, or the history of atoms and the structure of molecules, and, in view of the unceasing expansion of the universe, the place of *time* as an essential factor in physical law. That time is a central, constitutive ingredient in our understanding of the universe, tells us that the universe must be regarded as finite in space and time, which forces us to ask questions about its beginning and its end, even on the level of natural scientific inquiry. But when in the midst of such inquiries the question *why* is raised, it has the effect of bringing theological science and natural science into closer relation to one another, if only through some rapprochement of their different objectives or ends.

(2) The fact that natural and theological sciences both operate under the constraint of an ultimate ground of order, which will not allow a divorce of actual order from the order that ought to be, shows us that there is only one rational order pervading the entire universe. Although this may take various forms, such as we have to express in terms of number rationality, word rationality, organismic rationality, or aesthetic rationality, they are all deeply interlocked. Distinctive differences and basic unity have to be taken into account in each field of inquiry, but under the constraint of the ultimate order of things over which we have no control and to which we owe obedience as something rationally imperative. To take this imperative seriously will not allow us to segregate in some Kantian fashion a categorical imperative that obtains in the moral realm but is not bound up

intelligibly with the ontology of the created universe; nor will it allow us to segregate a categorical imperative that obtains in the structures of created being but is not bound up intelligibly with transcendent obligations. That is to say, we are forced to rethink moral laws in terms of their intrinsic ontological grounds, and to rethink physical laws in terms of their contingent relations to a stable ground of intelligibility beyond themselves.

(3) There is a fundamental harmony between the "laws of the mind" and the "laws of nature," that is, an inherent harmony between how we think and how nature behaves independently of our minds. This is nowhere more evident than in the relation between mathematics and physics, a point that constantly provoked wonder from James Clerk Maxwell and Albert Einstein. Eugene Wigner of Princeton has expressed this in our own day by what he has called "the unreasonable effectiveness of mathematics in the natural sciences." In one sense, the theoretical concepts and structures that we employ are "free creations" of our minds, free in the sense, however, as Einstein argued, that they are not logically derived like necessary deductions; but they are not free in a more basic sense, for they arise in our minds under the compelling demands of reality, to which we ourselves belong in mind as in body. The more profoundly our understanding penetrates into the created universe, the more clearly and fully that "pre-established harmony" between mind and nature becomes manifest, between the way we think and what we think about.

In view of these developments we should not be surprised at the claim

that there are deep interrelations between the sciences, between various ways of understanding the universe in accordance with its inherent modes of order, all of which overlap and interpenetrate each other. Nor should we be surprised that this applies no less to the interrelations of *theological science* and *natural science*, although they are concerned in different ways with the kind of intelligible order inherent in the created universe. Natural science, of course, is concerned to explore and account for the ongoing processes in nature in their *autonomous* structures, that is, in their contingent reality as utterly *different from* the transcendent Reality of God. Theological science is concerned to understand and interpret states of affairs and events in the created universe, insofar as they are *dependent upon* God the Creator and Redeemer, and are specifically correlated to his revealing and saving purpose in history. But since both natural science and theological science operate within the same framework of space and time, which is the carrier of all our creaturely rationality, their inquiries cannot but overlap, even though they move in different directions owing to the different ends they have in view. And yet the more rigorous their questioning is, the more aware they are of the limits which they cannot rationally cross and the more ready they are to suspend judgment, and even to call for help from one another before the face of the Creator.

It is a highly interesting situation of this kind which we have now reached in sub-atomic particle research. The way in which quanta behave in our interaction with them is very baffling, for it resists precise de-

scription within the parameters of geometrically defined space and time to which we have been accustomed in atomic theory, so that, apparently, only an indirect account can be offered which has built into its basic equations the role of the observer. But then the question is raised as to whether our traditional impersonal understanding of physical reality should not be radically revised, for in actual fact there may be no reality in the universe which is not observer-conditioned! At this juncture absolutely fundamental epistemological questions are posed which physics cannot resolve alone, without engaging in dialogue at the deepest level with other sciences. It is not just that physics has found its limits, but that physics has gained a profound insight into the contingent nature of rational order which it cannot adequately grasp from its own restricted perspective, and where it needs help from beyond its own frontiers. Moreover, the more deeply scientific inquiry penetrates down to the rock-bottom structures of nature, such as "quarks," which are not self-explainable, it seems to be putting its finger upon the very edge between being and nothing, existence and creation, establishing contact with a state of affairs the intelligibility of which calls for a sufficient reason beyond itself. That is to say, quantum theory has the effect of forcing out into the open the contingent nature of physical reality in such a way as to make a genuine doctrine of creation pertinent in its own field.

How are theologians to react to this turn of events? Certainly the more theologians have the courage to think out the profound interconnections between the Incarnation and the crea-

tion, the more they will be forced to regard the startling patterns disclosed by scientific research in the space-time universe as constituting in its contingent rational order a "*created correspondence*" (Karl Barth's expression) to the uncreated Rationality of God himself. This will involve rather more than courage, however. It will mean that theologians must be prepared for the kind of hard intense thinking to which physicists are accustomed, if they are to partner them in any way at these exciting points in the advance of scientific knowledge. The rewards for both theology and physics in this kind of partnership will surely be very valuable, if only in the discovery that there is and always has been a hidden traffic of ideas of surprising significance for both physics and theology.

Now the fact that there are deep interrelations between natural scientific and theological inquiry means that the advantages and disadvantages, the truths and errors, in one inquiry are liable to affect the other inquiry. That there have been such interrelations between theological science and natural science which have influenced the course of each inquiry very profoundly is evident from the way in which the notions of *contingence* and *inertia* have arisen and played a very far-reaching role in modern science.

Let us turn first to the concept of *contingence* which, as we know from an examination of the history of Western thought, has a basically Christian source. This is not at all the ancient Greek notion of "accident" or "chance" which was contrasted to the orderly and rational, the necessary and the timeless or the eternal, as something essentially disorderly and irrational. In relating the Incarnation of the Lo-

gos to the creation, however, Christian thinkers came up with the idea that the whole universe in matter and form is created out of nothing, just as man himself, body and mind, is created out of nothing. For the pagan Greek mind that was an impious doctrine, since it implied that the eternal divine forms immanent in the cosmos were created out of nothing, and it was rejected as a form of atheism.

Nevertheless, it was this Christian concept of contingent form, contingently intelligible order, that was eventually to become the ultimate foundation upon which our empirical and theoretical science were to rest. It is because nature is contingent that we cannot read off its rational order through logico-deductive operations merely after the pattern of Euclidean geometry, but may discover the kind of rational order embedded in nature only through asking nature to *reveal itself* to us. This is what we do through scientific experiments, when we put questions to nature in the physical mode appropriate to it, and get back answers which we could not obtain otherwise. Moreover, because nature is contingent not only in its matter but in its form or order, the kind of science we need for our understanding of it must be formal or theoretical as well as empirical.

The problem was precisely how to relate the empirical to the theoretical: how to grasp the actual way in which empirical and theoretical elements are found wedded together in nature, and how, therefore, to understand the way they must be brought together in the structure of science itself if it is to go on being successful. That was a much more difficult problem than modern science at first realized, blinded no

doubt by the astonishing advances in scientific knowledge of the universe achieved by Newton. A more satisfactory answer to the problem was given by Michael Faraday and James Clerk Maxwell, both of whom were deeply influenced by the Christian doctrine of creation in thinking out a way to express "the real modes of connection" in nature in the face of the failure of Newtonian mechanical connections to explain the electromagnetic field. But it was left to Einstein to show, especially through the theory of general relativity, how the Newtonian way of relating geometry and experience had to be replaced by another, in which the theoretical and the empirical interpenetrate one another in nature and correspondingly in the structure of science.

Here, then, we have a basic concept thrown up by Christian theology that has played an all-important role in natural science. Contingent order or intelligibility is a feature of nature that forces itself more and more upon our scientific inquiry, in the realization that order is not self-explanatory, not self-sufficient, not timeless or necessary, but order that is dependent on an ultimate rational ground beyond, with reference to which the created order is the kind of order that it actually is and ought to be: contingent, open-structured order, ever reaching beyond what we can grasp or define within the four corners of our propositions or equations. This is constantly impressing itself upon us in the altogether surprising character of the universe, and correspondingly in the surprising turns that are taken in scientific theory.

Now let us consider the other concept mentioned above, that of *inertia*.

It is not difficult to trace its source either, in late Patristic and mediaeval theology—not to mention Neoplatonic and Arabian thought—particularly as the doctrine of the immutability and impassibility of God became tied up with the Aristotelian notion of the “unmoved mover” or a center of absolute rest which was resurrected and powerfully integrated with Latin scholastic philosophy, science, and theology. In theology itself, it induced a deistic disjunction between God and the world, which scholastic thought tried to modify through bringing into play all four Aristotelian causes, the “final” and “formal” along with the “material” and “efficient” causes. The effect of this, however, was not to overcome the dualist modes of thought inherited through St. Augustine, the great *Magister Theologiae*, but actually to harden the dualism by throwing it into a causal structure. This was particularly apparent in the conception of sacraments as “causing grace,” which was further aggravated (as in the doctrine of the “real presence”) by the acceptance of Aristotle’s definition of place as the immobile limit of the containing body. In mediaeval science, on the other hand, the conception of a causal system ultimately grounded in and determined by a center of absolute rest had the effect of obstructing attempts to develop empirical interpretations of nature for it denigrated *contingentia* as irrational.

It was, alas, the theological and metaphysical concept of inertia thrown up in this way that was taken up and built into the fabric of Western classical science by Galileo, Descartes, and Newton, when inertia, used as a kind of mathematical “x” from which to

make calculations about bodies in motion became mythologized into a kind of force. There is no doubt that inertia played a very important role in the remarkable elaboration of a coherent and consistent “system of the world” within the static parameters of Euclidean geometry, which was very successful within its own limits. The end result, however, was the damaging idea of the closed mechanistic universe, by which not only theology but all our Western culture became seriously infected. The concept of inertia is still proving very difficult to dislodge, in spite of the work of Clerk Maxwell and Einstein, Bohr and Heisenberg, but this is due, in part at least, I believe, to the fact that the cultural framework of thought, within which scientific inquiry and theory operate and are expressed, has been profoundly shaped by it. In this way inertia has itself acquired a hidden inertial force, in virtue of which it continues to obstruct the kind of open-textured scientific thinking required at the frontiers of knowledge. In face of this Christian theology can only cry *mea culpa, mea maxima culpa*, for it was largely through its influence that modern classical science took this unfortunate path.

Today a steady conflict between these two basic notions of order, contingent order and inertial order, continues to take place, and not always below the surface. In the course of this conflict there have been thrown up new ways of thought that are shaking themselves free of mechanistic, deterministic structures, as it is increasingly realized that nature is much more subtle (*rafiniert* was Einstein’s term) and flexible than can be expressed in terms of the old couplet “chance and

necessity." The universe is now found to have an open-structured, labile nature, which is no less but all the more deeply rational than the older closed deterministic view of the universe allowed. This movement within science, however, has been taking place at a time when our theology in large part is still trapped in rigid Newtonian patterns of thought, and is thus unable to give scientific inquiry the kind of basic help it needs in the fundamental ideas that it must develop in order to do justice to the actual nature of the universe as it is now daily being disclosed to us.

The great questions now being thrust upon our natural science run something like this: Is there a range of reality that does not lie within the realm of what we call nature? Why is it that the rate of the expansion of the universe and the tight-knitted nuclear structure of matter seem to indicate that the physical laws which we have to formulate under the pressure of nature's inherent modes of order are so staggeringly improbable? Must we not now think of the order characterizing nature at all levels as radically contingent and as pointing to a rationality that extends indefinitely beyond it? Does the order of the created universe not depend after all upon a divine Creator and his will and order *for* the universe and its open-ended development?

It seems to me that at precisely this point there can be fruitful correlation between theology and science. As the mathematical physicist, John Polkinghorne, has recently expressed it: "Behind the intelligibility of the universe, its openness to the investigation

of science, there lies the fact of the Word of God. The Word is God's agent in creation, impressing his rationality upon the world. That same Word is also the light of men, giving us thereby access to the rationality that is in the world." If that is the case, as I believe it to be, scientists and theologians must surely act and think together in inquiring as deeply as they can into the interrelation between the kind of order that is disclosed through the Incarnation of the Word, the creative order of redeeming Love, and the kind of order that nature discloses to our scientific inquiries, an open-textured order that is unable to reveal to us its own deepest secret but can only point mutely and indefinitely beyond itself. Yet since this is an order that we may apprehend only as we allow our minds to yield to the compelling claims of reality, it is found to be an order burdened with a latent imperative which we dare not, rationally or morally, resist, the order of how things actually are which we may appreciate adequately only as we let our minds grope out for what things are meant to be and ought to be.

It is when this order that impregnates nature and pervades the whole universe is correlated with the Word of God incarnate in Jesus Christ, that it becomes articulate beyond what it is capable of in itself, and as such becomes not only a sounding board, as it were, for the message of the Truth and Love of God in Jesus Christ, but the means whereby that message may be received, understood, and actualized in human life and civilization as perhaps never before.

Beyond Deterrence

by GIBSON WINTER

*A native of New York and an ordained priest of the Episcopal Church, the Reverend Gibson Winter is Maxwell M. Upson Professor of Christianity and Society at Princeton Theological Seminary. An alumnus of Harvard (A.B.), Cambridge Episcopal Theological School (B.D.), and Harvard University (Ph.D.), Dr. Winter has taught at the Divinity School of the University of Chicago, and is the author of numerous books, including *Liberating Creation* (1982).*

Text: They do not know to do what is right, they who store up violence and destruction in their strongholds. (Amos 3:10)

TODAY, we enjoy a propitious moment in the struggle to halt the arms race. Jonathan Schell's book, *The Fate of the Earth*, sent a shock wave through this land two years ago. Shortly afterwards, at the United Nations, a protest march gathered a cross-section of American people in favor of a nuclear freeze. A year later, the Catholic Bishops issued a pastoral letter calling for immediate reduction in nuclear armaments. The Pastoral Letter of May 1983 gave heartening support to citizens concerned over the escalation in the nuclear arms race. Thus, the events of the last two years bring us to a point where we may assess our situation.

The Bishop's Pastoral Letter is a sign of a new mood in our land. There is a growing chasm between our government and morally concerned citizens over the question of military escalation. This gap in moral sensibility has been growing over the past decade. It is far more than a distaste for the militaristic posturing of the Reagan administration, though that has certainly exacerbated the moral crisis. This moral chasm reflects an awareness among citizens that we are pursuing a self-defeating national policy. Meanwhile, our government seems less

and less responsive to this widening dissent. Governmental inflexibility is also a factor generating the spiritual and moral chasm; indeed, nuclear politics is intensifying governmental preoccupation with secrecy and security; it is concentrating more and more power in the military-governmental-industrial-academic complex; it is putting our democratic heritage at risk. If dissent increases, the government will have to resort to deceit or turn to coercion; indeed, they are already deeply entangled in deceit of the American public over matters such as Soviet armaments.

As we approach this critical moment in national affairs, it is important to be clear about the controversy between government and people. The issue is not security! Everyone is agreed on the importance of security. No one has any illusions that Soviet Russia will retreat from its aggressive military posture in the world. Soviet leaders are essentially conservative on such matters, especially after suffering millions of casualties in World War II. The real question of security is how we achieve mutual understanding and realistic limits. Here is where the moral gap is growing. The United States and

Soviet Russia are committed to a policy of deterrence in order to achieve security, yet deterrence creates an atmosphere of hostility and suspicion, generating increasing armaments.

The Catholic Bishops agonized over the question of deterrence in forging their Pastoral Letter. They finally settled for a qualified moral justification of deterrence, hedged about with seven conditions which practically make deterrence unworkable.

The Pastoral Letter put the matter as follows:

These considerations of concrete elements of deterrence policy, made in the light of John Paul II's evaluation, but applying it through our own prudential judgments, lead us to a strictly conditioned moral acceptance of deterrence. We cannot consider it adequate as a long-term basis for peace (p. 175, third revision).

The Bishops accept deterrence only as a transitional step to a halt "... in testing, production and deployment of new nuclear weapons systems," and with the understanding that there is movement toward reduction in both nuclear and conventional armaments. (The disappointing reality is that armaments have continued to increase in the ensuing year.)

These confusing moves by the Bishops pose the question of what a policy of deterrence means. It has a familiar ring which may account for its success. It resonates with law and order. Stiffer punishments to deter crime in the streets. However dubious it may be as a moral principle, deterrence has a certain credibility in dealing with domestic crime. In interna-

tional policy, it is a fiction, for there is no political body overseeing its administration.

"Defense" literature treats deterrence as dissuasion of a potential adversary by the threat of unacceptable retaliatory damage. Actually, deterrence, in English usage, means to frighten, to terrify, to discourage through fear. The Latin root of deterrence probably derives from dreadful experiences of earthquakes. It is a powerful metaphor arising from and evoking earthshaking destruction.

A policy of deterrence holds peoples throughout the world as hostages to nuclear weaponry. It maintains a world of mutual assured destruction—the MAD world that now holds sway. It institutionalizes the Hobbesian principle of the war of each against each. It creates a world of total violence.

The Hobbesian law of nature—the war of each against each—has a long and successful history in Western life. It conceives a human being who is driven by desire for power and fear of death. This view contributed immensely to the justification of our marketing world—a world for pursuit of gain and advantage. It undergirded the Western commitment to progress through accumulation. Deterrence is the other side of this pursuit of private interests. It is the side that commits governments to protect the property and possessions of those who have accumulated successfully.

This Hobbesian philosophy is a perverse understanding of human existence. Human communities would not have survived for these many eons on the basis of such a principle; indeed, the Western project is now demonstrating that peoples organized

on such a principle may not long survive on this earth. We humans are social beings, we only survive through sociality. Conflict seems to be a regulative rather than constitutive principle of life. Peoples respond to aggression by asserting independence and subjecthood, by resisting intrusions, and finally by seeking retribution. If we threaten others, seek to dominate and exploit them, they will ultimately rebel, taking revenge so far as they are able. Deterrence erodes the moral community that binds peoples together. Deterrence reinforces ethnocentric fears, intensifying them to the point of genocidal conflict.

The tragic fact is that deterrence cannot create conditions for resolution of the arms race. Even advisors to the defense establishment, which is really a war establishment, admit that deterrence leads to weapons creep; each side fears that the other side is gaining the advantage and plans for escalation. Deterrence is a principle of automatic escalation.

Deterrence is creating a moral chasm within our national life, pitting the government against the people, leading to deceit and the end of democracy. Many citizens are paralyzed by fear as their government threatens them with annihilation by the enemy. Thus, anxious passivity is a constant danger. However, escalating deficits, stripping of programs of nutrition for school children, spreading hunger and homelessness, talk of 60 to 100 million casualties—these and other horrors of an escalating arms race gradually bring home to people the character of the journey on which we have embarked. Further, our Jewish and Christian traditions reject this definition of the neighbor as enemy and a waste of re-

sources in preparation for all out warfare. Care for the poor and needy takes first place in the Jewish and Christian Scriptures. This is the moral imperative guiding our religious communities, setting the people against the immorality of a government committed to genocidal conflict.

There is a text in the Book of Amos that speaks dramatically to our condition:

They do not know to do what is right, They who store up violence and destruction in their strongholds (3:10).

Amos speaks here of the violence being prepared against neighbors and also the violence employed against the poor and needy through which this violence is prepared. The food and shoes of the poor have been expropriated to fill the coffers of Jeroboam II, his courtiers, and their sycophants. "They do not know to do what is right." They have forgotten how judgments are to be made at the gate where justice is done for the poor and hungry. The powerful pursue the way of violence.

This text speaks to our children. It calls us to consider our ways and turn from this path of violence. It calls us to forsake this Hobbesian way of genocide and recognize our neighbor as fellow sojourner on this earth. This call is far broader than turning from the arms race. It is a call to build human community and structures of care in a society that has lost its moral sense. It is a call to heed the cries of the hungry at home and throughout our world, to turn our resources to an exchange of care rather than advantage. It is a call to see that justice is

done at the gate where the poor and needy are gathering in greater and greater numbers.

These are dark and troubled times, even though they are brightened by the concern of more and more citizens over the immorality of our national policies. This very darkness can be the

occasion of turning, even as the shadow of the Cross shed light on the Christian community. This can be our open time, the time of coming to ourselves before it is too late, learning once again to do what is right, to live with our neighbors in some sensible mode of mutuality and peace.

A Spirituality for Combat

by M. M. THOMAS

A self-educated theologian, ethicist, and political analyst, M. M. Thomas is the former President of the Central Committee of the World Council of Churches. He was instrumental in forming what is now the Christian Conference of Asia and founded the Christian Institute for the Study of Religion and Society in India. Presently Dr. Thomas is Visiting Professor of Theology at Princeton Theological Seminary, and Director of the Juhanon Mar Thoma Society Center in India. He is the author of several books and is currently writing reflections on Biblical books in Malayalam, his native language.

Text: God forgave us all our sins; He cancelled the unfavorable record of our debts with its binding rules and did away with it completely by nailing it to the Cross; and on the Cross Christ freed himself from the power of the spiritual rulers and authority; and he made a public spectacle of them by leading them as captives in his victory procession. (Col. 2:13-15)

For our meditation this morning I want to take the last verse which says that the Cross of Jesus Christ brought victory over spiritual rulers and authorities.

Hendrik Kraemer, the Dutch mis-
siologist, who was also for many years
Director of the Ecumenical Institute
in Bossey, near Geneva, used to say
that every person needed two conver-
sions—the first conversion from self
to God and the second from God to
the world. The first one appropriates
Divine forgiveness and finds a stand-
ing ground for oneself before God;
the second one moves to combat the
evils of the world around in the power
of God. It is about this second con-
version, “to the world with God,” that
I want to speak briefly today. Without
this second conversion, as an Evan-
gelical Consultation on Gospel and
Culture rightly said, we often let “a
privatized gospel of personal forgive-
ness” coexist with “a demonic attitude

to wealth and power” in our corporate
life.

If you will excuse me, let me share
with you my own personal experience
of this second conversion to the world.

Early in my student days in college
(that was a long time ago!), I had a
deep evangelical experience of con-
version in which Jesus Christ became
real to me as bearer of God’s pardon
and power in personal living; and I
was also enthusiastic about winning
souls for Christ. But I was very in-
different to social evils around me and
to the idol-worships underlying them.
And you will be surprised to know
that the three people who made me
aware of the spiritual significance of
the corporate life and the structures
of culture, society, and state, were in
the first place non-Christians—
Jawaharlal Nehru, Karl Marx, and
Mahatma Gandhi. In the late thirties
and forties, Christians in my state in
India became involved in the struggle

for responsible government and social justice and became part of the national struggle for political freedom; and it was then that we began to listen to national leaders Gandhi and Nehru and to study Karl Marx to understand the Indian society. India's caste system enslaved one fifth of the people of India as outcasts for several centuries; Nehru, though a secular humanist, used to attack the system, not just as irrational. Using religious language he spoke of "this demon of caste" which has to be "exorcised" from the body-politic of India. And Karl Marx, in spite of his rationalist approach to history, had to use the categories of primal religion to explain mass poverty in the midst of affluence. As the tribal peoples saw in some natural objects like a piece of wood or stone or in a human bone or hair independent magical and mysterious spiritual power which they called *fetisch*, Karl Marx spoke of the fetichism of commodity produced for the market. That is, he saw in the economic system itself some built-in power of alienation which produced poverty and oppression, a power which appeared as mysterious and spiritual to people. And Gandhi as a religious Hindu spoke of the satanic forces of modern materialistic civilization ruining the people of India. And he said, "I want to realize God and attain salvation, but I shall not withdraw from the world and go to some cave in the Himalayas as many religious Indians have done; no, I need not do that, for I carry 'a cave in my heart' to which I can retreat with God renouncing the world, but only to return to the world of politics with God to fight the satanic forces in the world." And he spoke of the spirituality of detachment, *nishkama karma*, as the

basis of his political struggles. It was out of this combination of spirituality and politics that his ethic of non-violent resistance to corporate evils emerged.

That traditional and modern corporate structures of Indian society were under the sway of demons, fetishes, and satanic forces which have to be fought came as an important discovery for me. Also Gandhi's idea of a religious spirituality for combatting these spiritual evils built into the corporate life of India struck me. And it was this that led many of us in the student and youth Christian movements of Kerala to go to the Bible and to find there not merely the Christ who brought divine forgiveness to individuals but also the Christ victorious over "principalities and powers." These principalities and powers are in fact the sins of idolatry of many generations accumulated and institutionalized in social structures, economic systems, and cultural traditions and which have acquired an independent momentum in our common life and on individuals now living. The ecumenical movement also helped us at this point of understanding this dimension of Christ. In 1939 the World Christian Youth Assembly at Amsterdam met under the banner: *Christus Victor*; and I remember later reading Aulen's book of that title. And in 1947 the Oslo World Conference had as its theme: Jesus Christ the Lord of the World.

Jesus Christ is both Savior and Victor; He is not only the lover of my soul but also the Lord of the universe. This is precisely what the verses read to you from the Epistle to the Colossians affirm. Christ on the Cross annulled our debts under the law and

brought us divine forgiveness; and Christ on the Cross in spiritual combat defeated the powers and principalities which enslaved the world and made them part of Christ's victory procession. The imagery here is clear. When the Roman generals returned victorious from battles, Rome had victory processions in which kings and generals defeated by them were put in chains and paraded in the procession. St. Paul is using this imagery to say that in Christ's march of triumph in our world history, the forces of corporate evil are made a public spectacle as captives of Christ. So that communion with God through Christ becomes for us the source of a spirituality of hope, of discernment, and of participation with Christ in His continuing combat against the forces of corporate idolatry, self-righteousness, and inhumanity built into the struc-

tures of our modern culture, society, economics, and politics.

Dag Hammarskjöld in his book of meditations, *Markings*, says: "The road to holiness in our day lies through the world of action."

To those Indians who worshipped God in temples with doors all shut to keep away the noises of the street, Poet Tagore said, "Open your eyes and see, your God is not before you; He is where the tiller is tilling the hard ground and the path-maker is breaking stones; stand with Him in sun and shower; what if your clothes get soiled." He is there with "the least, the lowliest and the lost" struggling for humanity and new life. It is there you meet God.

I suppose all of you had your first conversion. Have you had your second conversion—of moving with Christ into the world?

CONFESSION AND INTERCESSION

L: God of all creation,
 Who has placed us in a garden
 to till it and keep it,
 We confess we have forgotten
 the responsibilities of our
 stewardship, and have misused
 the earth and its resources for
 the purpose of collective
 mastery over nature violating
 the limits of our creatureliness
 and of collective self-
 aggrandizement over our
 fellow humans denying the
 law of justice;
 Grant us and all humanity your
 grace so to order our
 relationship with nature that
 we may enhance the quality of
 our lives and the life of your
 whole family under heaven.

Lord, hear our prayer.
 R: And let our cry come to You.

L: God, Lord of our Common Life,
 Who found it was not good for
 human beings to be alone and
 bestowed upon us the gift of
 society, friendship, and love,
 You have made yourself known
 to us as the liberator of people
 from slavery and have bound
 us in a covenant of
 righteousness and community,
 Forgive the idolatrous worship of
 wealth and power built into
 our systems of political and
 economic life, and the self-
 righteousness of nation, race,
 caste, class, and sex which
 excuses all our pursuit of

collective egoism and
denomination,

And grant to all communities of
the world your grace that they
may open themselves to your
judgments and affirm your
law of righteousness through
realization of the universal
rights and dignity of all
human persons and peoples,

Lord, hear our prayer.

R: And let our cry come to You.

L: God our Redeemer,

Who through the life, death, and
resurrection of our Lord Jesus
Christ has created the church
as your people called to
fellowship around your Word
and your Table, to be the first
fruits of a new corporate
humanity,

We confess that we and our
churches have acquiesced in
collective systems which
destroy fellowship;

We have misused your gift of
technology which has made
the world one and

interdependent, to create mass
poverty in the midst of
affluence, to deny human
rights to weaker sections of
people among us and to
accumulate weapons of mass
destruction and war;

Grant your church the vision of
your kingdom which is and is
to come, that your church may
witness to the power which
redeems and transforms the
world;

Grant that all poverty may be
eliminated from the face of
the earth,

That the poor, the oppressed
among us and in all parts of
the globe may enjoy the rights
of freedom and opportunities
of fuller life,

That the world community may
enter into an era of security
without fear of nuclear
annihilation and of peace with
justice,

Lord, hear our prayer.

R: And let our cry come to You.

There is a Point in Living

by DONALD MACLEOD

In honor of James T. Cleland, Dean of the Chapel of Duke University, 1953-1973, the Trustees established the Cleland Chapel Endowment Fund to bring to the Chapel an outstanding preacher each academic year. Dr. Donald Macleod, Francis L. Patton Professor of Preaching and Worship Emeritus, of Princeton, was named the James T. Cleland Visiting Preacher for the academic year 1983-84. This sermon was given in the Duke Chapel on November 14, 1983.

Texts: *"I thought I had been laboring in vain, spending my strength for nothing."*
(Isaiah 49:4)

"Your work is not in vain in the Lord." (1 Corinthians 15:58)

In one of his poems John Greenleaf Whittier wrote these words:

Of all sad words of tongue or
pen,
The saddest are these: "It might
have been."

Today if any of you were to ask me to rewrite Whittier's lines to reflect the mood of many of our people, it might go this way:

Of all sad words that are on the
loose,
The saddest of these are: "What's
the use?"

Last year after the primary elections in one of our cities, a civic leader, looking back upon all the chicanery, dishonesty, and double dealing that went on, called the political process "an exercise in futility."

Several years ago a Presbyterian minister in Chicago sent out thousands of questionnaires to people in every walk of life. He received over four thousand replies, all of which he carefully indexed and tabulated. In each questionnaire only one point was raised: what is the outstanding ques-

tion you face in all your thinking and living? Twenty-two percent indicated their problem lay with their families; 48% said their problem was personal living and the seeming loneliness, general failure, and futility of it all.

On the bulletin board of an Ivy League university last spring this item appeared: "WANTED: a young couple to care for an elderly millionaire who has been taking tranquilizers for twenty years. This couple is needed desperately to give him meaning in life. He has nothing to live for."

An editorial in a college newspaper reflecting student opinion said this: "Our generation has known only death from the time we were born. We have no reason to believe we shall even be alive twenty years from now, much less hope for a better future. And we cannot count on the adults around us to inspire us with a new vision of a world transformed."

Now all these are contemporary echoes of our first text today which was a cry of discouragement from one of the greatest prophets of ancient Israel. For more than half a century the people of Israel had been exiles in pagan Babylon. But God had not aban-

doned them, for a new chapter of their history had begun to emerge: out of the North came Cyrus, the Persian warrior, whose pressures on the Babylonian empire eroded its strongholds and set the captives free. What a tremendous hour this was for the prophet Isaiah! Now his hopes were about to be fulfilled; now his prophecies would be vindicated. God had intervened and had opened a highway for the exiles to return to Jerusalem and to rebuild their temple as a free nation. Well might the prophet sing, "O Jerusalem that bringest good tidings; lift up your voice with strength; lift it up; be not afraid; say unto the cities of Judah, 'Behold your God!'"

But people everywhere are so human and even the best among us can be so disappointing. Some of these exiles refused to return home because they preferred the life of idolatry of the heathen. Others decided to come, but were so slow and reluctant that they tried the patience of the prophet. And some others, though they came readily, brought their pagan gods with them. Is it not surprising, then, that Isaiah who was at the peak of jubilation over the prospect of liberty, should on account of the slow reaction of his people be hurled momentarily into the pit of depression and dejection? Hear his lament: "I thought I had been laboring in vain, spending my strength for nothing." This was the day he had lived for; this was the hour towards which his soul had reached; yet so few shared his enthusiasm. And hence in a moment of sorry reflection he felt his life was pointless and useless; he saw no result for his labor; he perceived no rhyme nor reason to all his exacting toil.

And this, men and women, is fu-

tility. Moreover, this attitude and feeling that assailed the prophet Isaiah for a moment twenty-six centuries ago holds many of our people in its grip today. Despite all the benefits of science, culture, and progress, we are a confused, bewildered, and frustrated generation. The great Jewish philosopher, Martin Buber, was describing a few years ago the temperament of the people of Europe and he remarked, "They are working hard, but they are working in the dark." Now, whatever excuse might be given for this state of mind in Europe, it stirs our curiosity when we discover the disease of futility to be rampant today among vast numbers of Americans who have everything they want. Every day we meet people who seem to go through the motions of living as if they were waiting for a sudden and ominous catastrophe. Walk the streets of any of our cities and how one misses the uplifted face, the flashing eye, and shoulders braced and squared with courage. Men and women seem to believe like old Sorrell in Warwick Deeping's novel, "Man is fighting a lone fight against a vast indifference." Or, as an Englishman cried out recently, "What is the point of trying to be good when the devil seems to hold all the trump cards?" Something has seemingly gone out of our lives and into the vacuum has come the deadening mood of futility.

One evening Prime Minister David Lloyd George was called to the telephone from a political caucus in a smoke-filled room and a doctor's voice at the other end of the line said, "I regret to have to tell you, Sir, but your daughter is dead." Then and there he was staggered as never before; no political manipulation could do any good

in the face of this devastating fact; and turning from the telephone he cried out of sheer futility, "Why doesn't life work?" This problem was not political or economic or national; it was basically moral and spiritual. For if people could believe greatly in something, if they could see the outline of a purpose that would give reason and reality to daily living, then life would wear the radiant image of victory.

By now* you are asking: what has Isaiah to do with all this? If he was the victim of futility among the simplicities of his life, what has he to say to the complex situation of the twentieth century? Simply this: although Isaiah was assailed by futility in its bitterest form, yet he met it head on and defeated it because he was equipped with certain inner fundamentals that came from the mind and heart of the living God. And these were not merely ten little rules for confident living, but were deep convictions which came from observing the way God acts with men and women who were obedient to his will. And St. Paul, too, knew that, through obedience to the living and exalted Christ, "Your labor is not in vain in the Lord." Moreover, these spiritual truths by which God's great servants lived are still vital and valid in this generation in which we find ourselves. Let us take a look at this scripture passage in which Isaiah speaks and discover for ourselves three great convictions that can sustain us in our struggle with futility.

I

Isaiah had the conviction that *he had a place of significance and worth in human society*. Note in verse one how he puts it: "From my birth God hath made mention of my name."

Now, is not this one of the lost notes in much of our thinking and living today? Constantly we are told to see and safeguard the worth of other individuals—and rightly so—but the conditions of our age demand that we see also the worth of ourselves. The story is told of a group of working men and women who were passing through the security check at the gate of a government plant in the city of Glasgow, Scotland. One woman hadn't her ID card and she shouted to her husband who was some distance down the line, "Hurry, Jack, and bring my non-entity card!" This is part of our problem: too many people today are inclined to treat themselves as non-entities. They forget they are members of God's great family and that the quality of the whole depends upon the quality of every single unit in it. But if you and I believe that this universe is merely an accident or that life is (as one student put it) "a bad joke that isn't even funny," then it is folly to be concerned about ourselves or anyone else. However, if you and I believe that it was God who called us into being, we shall see life from a new perspective. We shall see ourselves to be endowed with a new perspective and be captivated by a new meaning. Then we shall want to make our lives morally and spiritually great in order to count 100% in God's plan for all humankind.

Not long ago on the CBS News we saw a view of the newly refurbished interior of the Ford's Theater in our nation's capital. I thought of that fateful night, April 14, 1865, when John Wilkes Booth approached the unguarded presidential box to assassinate Abraham Lincoln. Who was the president's bodyguard and where was he then? His name was John F. Par-

ker. His job: bodyguard to the President of the United States. Someone described him as a man who lived in a dim fog of mind and will. Always he got along somehow. Never could he be a somebody, so he decided to enjoy himself as a nobody. His orders that night were to be alert to any and every danger and to defend the President at all cost. But from where he was standing he couldn't see the stage, so he forsook his post and grabbed a seat.¹ And for over one hundred years our nation has worn the scar caused by one man's sense of futility. One man failed to respect his task and to feel that at that moment in that place he as an individual was indispensable.

On the other hand, whenever you and I see our work and ourselves to be claimed by a righteousness and justice not our own, the quality of human society is enriched and our contribution to the common good is made more real. "From your birth God hath made mention of your name." When you and I believe this, there is no room for futility and no one of us feels his or her work is in vain.

II

Isaiah had a second conviction: *he was an instrument in the hands of God*. Note what he says in verse 3 in reporting God's word to his own life: "Thou art my servant in whom I will be glorified."

While Isaiah was concerned about the task of counselling and encouraging his people, he was aware that the truth of God was being expressed through him. For, whenever men and women put themselves at God's disposal, he breaks into glory through

¹ I owe this item to Norman Vincent Peale from a sermon I heard over three decades ago. I have no actual historical reference.

them. And there is no greater inner enthusiasm you and I can experience than when God breaks into glory in and through our human life. But unfortunately Irwin Edman, in his book *Candle in the Dark*, could describe our usual status very aptly: "In the nineteenth century man was sad because he no longer believed in God; but in the twentieth century he is sadder still because he no longer believes in man." And certainly we cannot restore the conviction that we are instruments of God unless and until these deficiencies in nineteenth and twentieth century thinking are made up.

The Shorter Catechism says, "God is Spirit, infinite, eternal, unchangeable in his being, wisdom, power, holiness, justice, goodness, and truth." And just as light requires a surface to reflect it, else it is not seen, so also God's way and will are reflected in human witness and character. Therefore, when you and I do what is wise instead of what is indiscreet; when we ally our energy with the holy rather than the profane; when we commit our life to justice in place of what is unfair; when we seek truth rather than falsehood; we are on the side of God, doing his will, and through us others see his breaking into glory.

But it is just here that we continue to fail him.

One day on a playground in Boston some boys were teasing another lad who was a Sunday School boy and whose shoes were broken through at the toes and heels. And they said to him tauntingly, "If God really loves you, why doesn't he take care of you? Why doesn't he tell someone to buy you a pair of shoes?" And the boy answered, "I suppose he does tell somebody, but they just aren't listening." But when people do listen to that

call and claim from beyond themselves, they become God's instruments for the benefit and good of others, for he can only work through men and women for men and women. As the late John A. Mackay of Princeton Seminary once said, "We become related to Christ singly, but we cannot live in Christ solitarily." When you and I are committed to him, our lives are directed ever outward to work his purpose for his people. And when we are so involved, the thrill of our enthusiasm outstrips the encroachments of futility.

III

One further thought: not only had Isaiah the convictions that he had a place of significance and worth in human society and was an instrument in the hands of God, but more—he felt *he could trust in God's handling of tomorrow*. Note how he testified in verse 4: "Yet surely my judgment is with the Lord and my work with my God." He gave it all over to God and he conquered his sense of futility. He took Kierkegaard's "leap of faith." And this is always the initial step towards a life filled with meaning, direction, and purpose, where futility has no place.

Oh, but you interrupt: this is what all the preachers say, "Simply have faith and all will be swell." But those who talk this way are not sure of what faith is; for them it is believing in what you know to be untrue. And if that be so, then no scientist, no inventor, no explorer would ever have

budged an inch and the resources of this universe would have been left untapped, its laws untamed, and you and I would still be living in caves.

But the men and women of faith, whose lives have cheered and uplifted humanity, have had one watchword, LET GO and LET GOD! And Frederick Buechner said, "Hold fast by letting go." As William Barclay of Glasgow wrote, "It is the persons who are in a right personal relationship with God as a result of their faith who really live." And the enemy of this kind of life is our graceless, grasping inner selves which always want our own way, our own comforts, our own ends, and we continue to be miserable and to feel futile with them and without them. Henry Drummond, the great Scottish scientist and Christian, said, "The end of life is not simply to do good or to get good. It is just doing what God wills, whether that be winning or losing, suffering or recovering, living or dying."

At one time in Africa, David Livingstone felt for a while that his work was hopeless, futile, and in vain, but he fell back on Christ's promise, "Lo, I am with you always, even to the end of the world." And later Livingstone wrote in his diary, "These are the words of a man of the most sacred and strictest honor!"

"I thought I had been laboring in vain, spending my strength for nothing." "Your work is not in vain in the Lord." There is a point in living! How happy will be those who find it!

PUBLICATIONS BY MEMBERS OF THE FACULTY FOR 1983

DIOGENES ALLEN

Books

Three Outsiders: Pascal, Kierkegaard, and Simone Weil. Cambridge, MA: Cowley Publications.
Mechanical Explanations and the Ultimate Origin of the Universe According to Leibniz. Weisbaden, West Germany: Franz Steiner Verlag.

BERNHARD W. ANDERSON

Book

Out of the Depths: The Psalms Speak for us Today, revised and expanded version. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press.

Book Review

Review of *A History of Israel*, 3rd edition, by John Bright. *Interpretation* 37 (January):77-78.

RICHARD S. ARMSTRONG

Book

Service Evangelism (rev. ed.). Philadelphia: The Westminster Press.

Article

"Evangelism." *The Dictionary of Christian Theology*. London: SCM Press.

Book Review

Review of *I Believe in Church Growth*, by Eddie Gibbs. *The Princeton Seminary Bulletin* 4:221-223.

DONALD E. CAPPS

Book

Life Cycle Theory and Pastoral Care. Philadelphia: Fortress Press.

Articles

"Parabolic Events in Religious Autobiography." *The Princeton Seminary Bulletin* 4:26-38.

"Parabolic Events in Augustine's Autobiography." *Theology Today* 40:260-272.

Book Reviews

Review of *Liturgies and Trials*, by Richard K. Fenn. *Journal of the American Academy of Religion* 51:525-526.

Review of *Erikson: Identity and Religion*, by J. Eugene Wright. *Journal of the American Academy of Religion* 51:711.

Review of *Mesmerism and the American Cure of Souls*, by Robert C. Fuller. *Christian Century* 100 (April 20):376-378.

DORIS KRIMPER DONNELLY

Chapter in Book

"Prayer: The Response of the Contemporary Christian." In *Contemporary Spirituality: Responding to the Divine Initiative*, edited by Francis A. Eigo, pp. 63-89. Villanova, PA: Villanova University Press.

Articles

- "The Needle's Eye: Christians and Their Money." *The Christian Century* (April 18):400-402.
 "The Fall and Rise of Confession." *Christianity and Crisis* (August 15):312-314.
 "The Courage of Mary." *Sojourners* (November):23-24.
 "Prayer that Enables Forgiveness." *Praying* 2:16-20. Supplement of *The National Catholic Reporter*.
 "The Human Side of Forgiveness." *New Catholic World* 227 (1357):28-30.

Book Reviews

- Review of *Trusting*, by Carolyn Gratton. *Theology Today* 40 (July):239-240.
 Review of *A Cry of Absence*, by Martin Marty. *Theology Today* 40 (July):252-254.
 Review of *From Image to Likeness: A Jungian Path in the Gospel Journey*, by W. Howard Grant, Magdala Thompson, and Thomas E. Clarke. *America* 150 (6):119.

WILLIAM D. HOWDEN

Article

- "Pulpit and Table: Which Comes First?" *Christian Standard* 118 (September 11):11-12.

Book Reviews

- Review of *Practical Theology*, by Don S. Browning. *The Princeton Seminary Bulletin* 4:216-217.
 Review of *The Ministry in Historical Perspectives*, by H. Richard Niebuhr and Daniel D. Williams. *The Princeton Seminary Bulletin* 4:212-213.

DANIEL JENKINS

Articles

- "The Word, the Media, and the Marketplace." *The Princeton Seminary Bulletin* 4:88-94.
 "Culture" (revised). *The Dictionary of Christian Theology*. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, and London: SCM Press.
 "Congregational Theology." *The Dictionary of Christian Theology*. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, and London: SCM Press.

HUGH T. KERR

Book

- Conversions: The Christian Experience* (with John M. Mulder). Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company.

Pamphlet

- A Year with the Bible*. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press.

Articles

- "Residual Religion." *Theology Today* 39 (January):371-376.
 "Simple, But Not Easy." *Theology Today* 40 (April):1-4.
 "My Kind of Theology." *Theology Today* 40 (July):109-112.
 "In Tribute: James I. McCord." *Theology Today* 40 (October):257-259.

JAMES N. LAPSLEY

Chapter in Book

- "Practical Theology and Pastoral Care: An Essay in Pastoral Theology." In *Practical Theology: The Emerging Field in Theology, Church and World*, edited by Don S. Browning, 167-186. San Francisco: Harper & Row.

Book Reviews

Review of *Introduction to Pastoral Care*, by William B. Arnold. *The Princeton Seminary Bulletin* 4:217-218.

Review of *Psychology and Christianity: Integrative Readings*, by J. Roland Fleck and John D. Carter, editors. *Zygon* 18 (December):464.

SANG H. LEE

Articles

"Theological Education and the Urgent Needs in the Second-Generation Korean-American Ministry." *Korean-American Presbyterian Life* 7 (March):4-6.

"The Water of Life: A Sermon/Bible Study." *The Princeton Seminary Bulletin* 4:173-177.

THOMAS G. LONG

Chapter in Book

"Shaping Sermons by Plotting the Text's Claim Upon Us." In *Preaching Biblically*, edited by Don M. Wardlaw. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press.

Articles

"The Distance We Have Traveled: Changing Trends in Preaching." *Reformed Liturgy and Music* 27 (Winter):11-15.

"The Fall of the House of Uzziah . . . and Other Difficult Texts." *Journal for Preachers* 7 (Advent):13-19.

DONALD MACLEOD

Chapter in Book

"Preaching from the Psalms." In *Biblical Preaching*, edited by James W. Cox, pp. 102-118. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press.

Foreword

Foreword to *Principles of Preaching*, by Fr. Robert F. Morneau. Lake Worth, FL: Sunday Publications, Inc.

Editor

"Pulpit Resources and Ecumenical Commentary." *Good News Supplement*. Lake Worth, FL: Sunday Publications, Inc.

KATHLEEN McVEY

Book Reviews

Review of *The Apocalypse of Elijah: Based on P. Chester Beatty 2018*, by A. Pietersma and S. T. Comstock, editors. *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 45 (April):318ff.

Review of *A Short History of Syriac Christianity to the Rise of Islam*, by W. Stewart McCullough. *Journal of the American Academy of Religion* (December):695.

BRUCE M. METZGER

Chapters in Books

"The Fourth Book of Ezra." In *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*, edited by J. H. Charlesworth, vol. I, pp. 516-559. Garden City, NY: Doubleday & Company.

"The Prayer that Jesus Taught his Disciples." In *Sowing the Word, Biblical-Theological Essays*, edited by Patrick Rogers, C.P., pp. 125-134. Dublin, Ireland: Dominican Publications.

Articles

- "On Making Sense of the Book of Revelation." *Trinity Occasional Papers* 2 (January):46-56.
 "The Reader's Digest Bible" (with Ronald C. White, Jr.). *The Princeton Seminary Bulletin* 3:84-87.

Pamphlet

- The Jehovah's Witnesses and Jesus Christ (A Biblical and Theological Appraisal)*. Translated by Shing Chan Leung. Hong Kong: Seed Press Ltd.

Foreword

- Foreword to *A Concordance to the Apocryphal/Deuterocanonical Books of the Revised Standard Version*. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company.

Book Reviews

- Review of *The Profile Method of Classifying and Evaluating Manuscript Evidence as Applied to the Continuous Greek Text of the Gospel of Luke*, by Frederick Wisse. *The Princeton Seminary Bulletin* 4:130-131.
 Review of *The Horizontal Line Synopsis of the Gospels, Greek Edition*, by R. J. Swanson. *Religious Studies Review* 9 (January):73.
 Review of *The King James Bible Translators*, by Olga S. Opfell. *Religious Studies Review* 3 (July):263.
 Review of *Computer-Konkordanz zum Novum Testamentum Gaece von Nestle-Aland, 26. Auflage, und zum Griech New Testament*, 3rd edition. *Religious Studies Review* 3 (July):272.
 Review of *Statistik des Neutestamentlichen Wortschatzes Beiheft*, by Robert Morgenthaler. *Religious Studies Review* 3 (July):273.

DANIEL L. MIGLIORE

Book

- The Power of God*. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press.

Article

- "Jesus Christ, the Reconciling Liberator: The Confession of 1967 and Theologies of Liberation." *Journal of Presbyterian History* 61 (Spring):33-42.

Book Reviews

- Review of *An Introduction to Protestant Theology*, by Helmut Gollwitzer. Translated by David Cairns. *The Review of Books and Religion* 11 (February):4.
 Review of *Karl Barth-Rudolf Bultmann Letters 1922-1966*. Translated by Geoffrey W. Bromiley. *The Princeton Seminary Bulletin* 4:58.
 Review of *Karl Barth Letters 1961-1968*. Translated by Geoffrey W. Bromiley. *The Princeton Seminary Bulletin* 4:58-59.

SAMUEL H. MOFFETT

Chapter in Book

- "The Greatest Enemy is Within." In *The Church in New Frontiers for Missions*, edited by David A. Fraser. Monrovia, CA: Missions Advanced Research and Communication Center, 1983.

JAMES H. NICHOLS

Book Reviews

- Review of *The Popes and European Revolution*, by Owen Chadwick. *Church History* 52:223.
 Review of *The Church in the Age of Absolutism and Enlightenment*, by Hubert Jedin, editor. *Church History* 52:222.

BEN C. OLLENBURGER

Book Review

Review of *Prophetic Faith and the Secular Age*, by Levi A. Olan. *The Princeton Seminary Bulletin* 4:202-203.

J. J. M. ROBERTS

Essays

"Isaiah 33: An Isaianic Elaboration of the Zion Tradition." In *The Word of the Lord Shall Go Forth*, edited by Carol L. Meyers and M. O'Connor, 15-25. Philadelphia: American Schools of Oriental Research.

"The Divine King and the Human Community in Isaiah's Vision of the Future." In *The Quest for the Kingdom of God: Essays in Honor of George E. Mendenhall*, edited by H. B. Huffmon, F. A. Spina, and A. R. W. Green, 127-136. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns.

Book Reviews

Review of *Old Testament Wisdom: An Introduction*, by James L. Crenshaw. *The Princeton Seminary Bulletin* 4:56-57.

Review of *Jewish Literature Between the Bible and the Mishnah*, by George W. E. Nickelsburg. *The Princeton Seminary Bulletin* 4:57.

Review of *The Book of Joshua*, by Martin H. Woudstra. *The Princeton Seminary Bulletin* 4:124.

Review of *Justice and History in the Old Testament*, by Richard Adamiak. *The Princeton Seminary Bulletin* 4:124-125.

Review of *Psalms 1-50*, by Peter C. Craigie. *The Princeton Seminary Bulletin* 4:125-126.

Review of *From Chaos to Covenant. Prophecy in the Book of Jeremiah*, by Robert P. Carroll. *The Princeton Seminary Bulletin* 4:126-127.

Review of *The Rendering of God in the Old Testament*, by Dale Patrick. *The Princeton Seminary Bulletin* 4:128-129.

Review of *Situation and Theology: Old Testament Interpretations of the Syro-Ephraimite War*, by Michael E. W. Thompson. *The Princeton Seminary Bulletin* 4:201-202.

CHARLES RYERSON

Essay

"Evangelism: The Encounter of Faiths in a Pluralistic World." In *Essays in Celebration of the C.I.S.R.S. Silver Jubilee*, edited by S. K. Chatterji. Madras, India: C.L.S.-C.I.S.R.S.

KATHARINE D. SAKENFELD

Chapters in Books

"Feminine and Masculine Images of God in Scripture and Translation." In *The Word and Words: Beyond Gender in Theological and Liturgical Language*, edited by William D. Watley, 50-60. Princeton: Consultation on Church Union.

"Loyalty and Love: The Language of Human Interconnections in the Hebrew Bible." In *The Bible and Its Traditions*, edited by M. P. O'Connor and D. N. Freedman, 190-204. Special edition of *Michigan Quarterly Review* 22 (Summer).

MARK KLINE TAYLOR

Article

"Levi-Strauss: Evolving a Myth about Myths." *Religious Studies Review* 9 (April):97-105.

Book Review

Review of *The Point of Christology*, by Schubert M. Ogden. *Word and World* (Summer):325-328.

RONALD C. WHITE, JR.

Article

"Becoming More Like Christ." *Pilgrimage*, 12-26.

Editorials

"For the Good of the Company." *The Princeton Seminary Bulletin* 4:3-4.

"Piety and Learning." *The Princeton Seminary Bulletin* 4 (2):vi-viii.

"President James I. McCord: The Measure of His Leadership." *The Princeton Seminary Bulletin* 4:137-139.

Book Review

Review of *The Practice of Piety: Puritan Devotional Disciplines in 17th Century New England*, by Charles E. Hambrick-Stowe. *The Princeton Seminary Bulletin* 4:211-212.

D. CAMPBELL WYCKOFF

Chapter in Book

"From Practice to Theory—And Back Again." In *Modern Masters of Religious Education*, edited by Marlene Mayr. Birmingham, Alabama: Religious Education Press.

Articles

"The Challenge of the Christian Education." *The Church School Herald-Journal* (September-November).

"Tennent as Symbol." *The Princeton Seminary Bulletin* 4:178-182.

Book Reviews

Review of *The Creative Word: Canon as a Model for Biblical Education*, by Walter Brueggemann. *Theology Today* (April).

Review of *The Bible in American Education*, by David L. Barr and Nicholas Piediscalzi, editors. *Theology Today* (April).

BOOK REVIEWS

Fretheim, Terence E. *Deuteronomic History*. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1983. Pp. 160. \$7.95.

Terence Fretheim, an alumnus of the Seminary (D '68) and now Dean at Luther-Northwestern Theological Seminaries, writes this volume as part of a series designed "for those who are convinced that the Bible has meaning for our life today." He sets for himself the task of interpreting the Deuteronomic History in the Exilic context, which is "the only redactional stage of which we can be certain" (p. 18). He regards the dual redaction view as "too simple" and prefers to account for the diversity of materials in the corpus as the result of a school at work, perhaps from the time of Hezekiah.

Regarding the theological framework of the Deuteronomic History, the author posits that the "first commandment" (i.e., Deut. 5:7) "together with a certain understanding of God, constitutes the heart of" its concern (p. 23). The Deuteronomist is dealing with the issue of "faith and unfaith, and not of obedience and disobedience vis-à-vis an external code" (p. 21). Moreover, Fretheim suggests, Deuteronomy makes the distinction between command (singular) and "statutes and ordinances" (commandments), the former being the "first commandment" (p. 23). Commandments are "secondary," according to him; they are merely expressions of faith in everyday living. Such dichotomous distinctions, however, are eminently foreign to the Hebrew mindset. Indeed, an investigation into the usage of *ŠWH* and *MIŠWĀH* (Fretheim's "command") in Deuteronomy would show that no such distinctions can be made.

Following his generally good introduction, Fretheim proceeds to discuss nine pericopes from the Deuteronomic History. The exegetical treatment of these texts, however, is generally disappointing, given the sound guidelines that the author lays out for the would-be interpreter. One problem lies in Fretheim's eagerness to break new grounds, which, of course, is no easy task in a book of this size. He suggests, for instance, that 1 Sam. 3 be characterized as a "call narrative" and proceeds to identify the parts: divine confrontation (vv. 2-10); commission (vv. 11-14); ob-

jection (v. 15); reassurance (vv. 16-19a); and sign-authentication (3:19b-4:1). Aside from the difficulty of defining what is meant by a "call narrative," Fretheim would still be hard pressed to convince form-critics that he is not forcing the text into an artificial outline.

In his desire to read 2 Sam. 7:1-17 in its larger literary context, Fretheim feels compelled to harmonize the claim in 2 Sam. 7:1 that God had given David rest from *all* his enemies, with the reference in the following chapter to David's military exploits. He observes that the rest which Yahweh gave to David had a "now and not yet" character (p. 111). In such a literalistic understanding of the text Fretheim has failed to understand that such claims of conclusive and abiding peace were part and parcel of royal propaganda in the ancient Near East. So one notes, for example, 1 Kgs. 5:4-5 (EV 4:24-25), 5:17-19a (EV 5:3-5), and the inscription of Azitawadda from Karatepe (*KAI* 26.I.10-11), and the inscription of Bir-Rakib (Panammu II *KAI* 215, 9-13).

In his treatment of 2 Kgs. 5, Fretheim suggests that we may have a liturgical outline here, and that "it may represent a form of worship, which was used in healings" or a service of penitence (p. 147). Even though he cautions against associating such a liturgy with Christian baptism, he notes that there are common elements in God's working then and now, namely, "the centrality of the Word of God," the use of the "visible means," the consequent "confession of faith, and the life to be lived" (p. 147).

Furthermore, in his exegesis of the text, he denies that Naaman was returning to superstition and syncretism (see vv. 15-19). Rather, he believes, the text indicates that Naaman's insight into the nature of grace enabled him to "recognize the freedom that a person of faith has in entering into life." This, says Fretheim, illustrates what Luther meant by "sin boldly!" (p. 156). Now, one must applaud any exegete who ventures to take the text from its ancient context to speak relevantly to the average person in the pew, but reading our theologies into the biblical text simply does violence to it. It is farfetched to imagine that the Deuteronomist was in any sense Proto-Lutheran in his theology.

These reservations notwithstanding, the book is still recommended to theological students

and pastors as a provocative and often insightful work.

C. L. SEOW

Princeton Theological Seminary

Greenberg, Moshe. *Ezekiel 1-20*. Vol. 22, *The Anchor Bible*. Garden City, NY: Doubleday & Company, Inc., 1983. Pp. xv + 388. \$16.00.

Craigie, Peter C. *Ezekiel*. The Daily Study Bible Series. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1983. Pp. x + 321. \$7.95 (paper).

Though these two commentaries on Ezekiel are as different as night and day, each is excellent in its own way. Greenberg's work is a standard critical commentary, and will be particularly valuable for the scholar, minister, or layperson who has had some training in Hebrew. Craigie's work is intended for devotional reading, and thus aims for a much broader readership. It will not take the place of a critical commentary, but it is based on critical study, and the scholar who wants to reflect on the theological or devotional treasures of the book of Ezekiel will find valuable resources here.

Greenberg's work breaks with the current tradition of critical commentaries on Ezekiel in attributing far less of the book to secondary accretions. He offers what he calls a "holistic interpretation" of the text. His procedure involves four steps: 1) first he divides the text into sections by the formalized openings and closings found in the text; 2) then he offers a translation with textual annotations; 3) this is followed by his "comment," which discusses lexicon, grammar, context, and Near Eastern parallels; and 4) finally he concludes with a discussion of the literary structure and themes of the unit under consideration.

Though Greenberg points to the difficulties of using the Greek text to correct the traditional Hebrew text, and though he obviously places great value on the traditional Hebrew text, he does not ignore the ancient translations. His treatment of the lexicon and grammar of the Hebrew text, however, is the great strength of his commentary. That and his constant attention to Ancient Near Eastern parallels helps him to avoid some of the superficial historical judgments that have marred other critical commentaries on Ezekiel.

Against the general critical view that there have been a lot of late secondary additions to the book, Greenberg argues that nothing in the book presupposes a historical setting later than the latest dated oracle in the book. Moreover, he argues that there are some prophecies of consolation or restoration in the early material prior to the fall of Jerusalem, just as there are some passages of condemnation that date after the fall of Jerusalem. The neat, logical categories of contemporary Western scholars should not be imposed on the material in the arbitrary fashion in which it is often done. In discussing the complicated and multivalent character of Ezekiel's symbols which modern scholars too often tailor and trim along the simple lines of earlier prophets, Greenberg argues "the possibility must be allowed that Ezekiel, the authentic Ezekiel, was baroque" (p. 219). One may not always be convinced by Greenberg's argument, but it is always suggestive, and it can hardly be ignored. This is a commentary that should find its place alongside Zimmerli's massive work as a standard reference tool for anyone doing serious exegetical work on Ezekiel. One can only hope that the second volume will appear in a reasonably short time.

Craigie's volume is one of the better volumes in the Daily Study Bible Series. His comments are based on solid exegetical work, yet he manages to speak to the concerns of the modern believer. In this regard his work is a worthy counterpart to the immensely popular New Testament series by the late William Barclay. One can only hope that it will enjoy a similarly broad readership. The widespread devotional use of volumes like Craigie's *Ezekiel* would not only enhance the devotional life of the Christian, it would also make an important contribution toward reducing the abysmal biblical illiteracy that threatens so much of the modern church.

J. J. M. ROBERTS

Princeton Theological Seminary

Terrien, Samuel. *The Elusive Presence: The Heart of Biblical Theology*. New York: Harper & Row, 1983. Pp. 511. \$12.95.

First published in 1978, Samuel Terrien's important work on biblical theology has now been reprinted, without changes, in paperback edition. It has already won for itself a wide

reputation and a significant place in current work on biblical theology.

Terrien's proposal is that "the heart of biblical theology" is to be found in the notion of God's presence. What he means by this is that the phenomenon of divine presence is central to Israel's religion in all of its aspects. To demonstrate the adequacy of this proposal Terrien examines various institutions (such as the temple), movements (such as Wisdom), literary forms (such as the Psalms), individual experiences (such as those of the prophets), specific texts (such as the Gospel of Mark), and a number of biblical motifs. In each of these he sees the elusive presence of God to be religiously central, and to provide the rationale for articulating a truly biblical theology: one which does justice to the New Testament as well as to all of the traditions of the Old Testament. For Terrien, God's presence is in dialectical relation with God's absence, and this dialectic gives rise to others, such as those of the aesthetic and the ethical, the name and the glory, the north and the south. Since the dialectical relations just mentioned are of vastly different categories— theological, geographical, and thematic—the question arises whether the unity they exhibit, the kind of unity which Terrien's notion of biblical theology requires, inheres in the texts or in the overarching framework into which Terrien places them. To put the problem another way, the unity which Terrien finds in the religion of Israel (as attested by both Testaments) is a unity lying below or above the texts, not in them, nor in the dialectically present God to whom they bear witness.

Perhaps the weakest part of Terrien's book is his methodological preface, in which he seeks to justify his own approach. Here he seeks to describe the failings of previous scholars, particularly Walther Eichrodt and Gerhard von Rad, who have dominated the field of Old Testament theology. His criticisms of these two scholars are tendentious and are adequately anticipated in their own works. Terrien scores them for failing to discover "within Old Testament religion that organic and specific element which not only points to the gospel of Jesus and the early church but also leads inevitably to the New Testament" (p. 36). Is it really biblical theology's task to discover the inevitable in history? Terrien maintains that biblical theology must seek "to elucidate the meaning of the Bible itself," and "translate it into the language of the cultural world view of the twentieth century." This is to be sharply

distinguished from the work of systematic theology, "which attempts to translate biblical dynamics of faith into the contemporary idiom" (p. 39). Is the language of our world view different from our contemporary idiom? In what does "the meaning of the Bible itself" consist?

Terrien's approach is really based on his goal of finding in the Bible "those elements of theological truth" which Christianity shares with both Judaism and Islam (p. 476). A dialectical conception of God's presence certainly accomplishes that goal, since it is flexible enough to encompass almost any religious movement or collection of religious texts. It may be asked, however, whether the Old and New Testaments are not more concerned with the identity of the God who is present even while absent, than they are with the phenomenon itself. What price are we willing to pay for the loss of the disturbingly radical particularity of the biblical texts?

Terrien is rare among biblical scholars for his religious and theological sensitivity, as well as for his appreciation of literary artistry. These gifts are evident in the fresh and stimulating insights he brings to various portions of Christian scripture, and also in the pleasure derived from reading his superbly written book. This work is a pleasant departure from the standard academic prose of biblical scholarship, even if at times the muse seems to take the author beyond what may legitimately be said, as in Terrien's claim that "For the would-be mystics of Zion, faith was 'the earnest of things unseen.' They nursed a divine truth which clamored to be fleshed in a human personality" (p. 315).

As is the case with most biblical theologies, Terrien's is worth reading more because of the passionate theological concern and mature wisdom he brings to the texts, than for the appropriateness of the method with which he seeks to undergird and justify his approach. This book will not replace those of von Rad or Eichrodt, but that does not diminish its worth.

BEN C. OLLENBURGER

Princeton Theological Seminary

Hanson, Paul D., ed. *Visionaries and their Apocalypses*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1983. Pp. 162. n.p.

Fortress Press has recently launched a very useful new series of books, called Issues in

Religion and Theology, consisting of seminal essays collected around a common issue or theme. This book, consisting of essays on the topic of apocalyptic, is the second volume of that series. It contains essays by seven contemporary scholars and an introductory essay by Paul Hanson, who edited the volume and contributed one of the essays. He also supplied a bibliography of selected works in English and German.

In his introductory essay Hanson states that he has selected for inclusion in this volume "essays representing every significant point of view current today." That would be an optimistic goal for a topic as hotly debated as apocalyptic, and is clearly impossible within the scope of the eight essays included in this book. In fact, significant points of view are omitted, such as those represented by Hartmut Gese, Ina Willi-Plein, G. N. M. Habets, and Christopher Rowland. One of the problems involved in determining currently significant points of view on apocalyptic is the lack of consensus on what we are talking about when we refer to apocalyptic. That is a problem taken up by Klaus Koch in his lead essay, "What is Apocalyptic?" (from his book *The Relevance of Apocalyptic*, 1972). Koch proposes that we identify certain pseudepigraphic texts, including Daniel, as apocalypses and then use these to formulate a definition of apocalyptic, on the basis of which we can then decide whether something is or is not apocalyptic. Despite the circularity of that proposal, Koch's argument has been helpful in bringing clarity to the discussion.

In his article, "Old Testament Apocalyptic Reexamined," first published in 1971, Paul Hanson proceeds without bothering to offer an operational definition of apocalyptic. He argues that texts such as Isaiah 24-27, Trito-Isaiah (chs. 56-66), and Zechariah 9-14 are to be called apocalyptic, principally because they differ in important respects from classical prophecy from which they otherwise derive. Hanson moves directly from Zechariah 9-14, which he dates in the sixth century B.C., to Daniel, jumping over four centuries in the process. Consequently, when Koch and Hanson are talking about apocalyptic they are talking about different things. Koch is talking about a literary phenomenon of the second century B.C., while Hanson is talking about developments in prophecy of the sixth century. Some clarity is brought to this particular problem by the articles of Michael Stone, "New Light on

the Third Century," and "Enoch and Apocalyptic Origins," both originally published in 1980. In these articles Stone provides tantalizing hints that some of what we find in apocalyptic literature is to be explained not on the basis of a strict dependence on prophecy or on traditional Israelite wisdom, but on the basis of a tradition of speculative wisdom, evidence of which is to be found in the earliest manuscripts of the book of Enoch. Stone believes that this tradition actually originated much earlier than Enoch, although it does not appear in the Bible, perhaps because of conscious suppression. This provides a fruitful context, it seems to me, from which to understand some aspects of the book of Daniel, in which wisdom and future expectation seem to be combined in a way not to be found elsewhere in the Old Testament.

Near Eastern wisdom traditions are also used by Jonathan Z. Smith to explain the origin of apocalyptic in his essay, "Wisdom and Apocalyptic" (1975). "Wisdom" is understood very broadly by Smith as an intellectual phenomenon common to the ancient world. He argues that scribes sought to catalogue and classify all phenomena as a means of understanding the world, and as a way of understanding events by relating them to these comprehensive catalogues. Since it was the king's responsibility to maintain the order of the world, if things went wrong it was because the king had violated the paradigmatic order of the cosmos. Apocalyptic arises when there is no longer a native king on the throne, and it anticipates a future of bliss when a native king is restored. While it is questionable whether this argument applies completely to the origins of apocalyptic in Israel, Smith's article is a model of the history of religions research and draws on a wide range of primary documents.

The book also contains articles by John J. Collins on "Apocalyptic Eschatology as the Transcendence of Death" (1974), Norman Perrin on "Apocalyptic Christianity" (taken from his *The New Testament: An Introduction*, 1974), and John Gager on "The Attainment of Millennial Bliss Through Myth: The Book of Revelation" (1975). Of these, the article by Collins is the most interesting and provocative. Anyone who reads the other essays in this book will probably be little stimulated by Perrin's contribution. To be sure, it was written for a much different audience than were the other essays. Unfortunately, the essay by Gager is probably the least interesting portion of his

otherwise stimulating book, *Kingdom and Community*. The introductory essay by Hanson provides a helpful orientation to the history of research on apocalyptic, although it seems to obscure some of the real disagreements among scholars in the field, including some of those whose essays appear in this volume.

The bibliography is curious. It omits important works by Beker, Collins, Hanhart, Hengel, Lambert, and others, yet includes thirteen works by Hanson, some of them not yet published. No more than two works by any other author are listed.

The essays in this volume range from Smith's very technical treatment of ancient literature to Perrin's popular survey. Some, such as Stone's, are purely historical, while Hanson's are almost overtly theological. The authors differ among themselves over which texts are at issue when one is discussing apocalyptic, and over what features of those texts mark them as apocalyptic. Further, they differ as to what one ought to do in order to understand how apocalyptic came to be and what purposes it served. The rich variety of this volume makes it a fitting introduction to the literature on apocalyptic, a subject on which there are as many views as there are scholars who study it. This book will well serve those who desire to sample the work of some acknowledged experts in this complex area of study. For that purpose I highly recommend it.

BEN C. OLLENBURGER

Williamson, Lamar, Jr. *Mark*. Interpretation: A Bible Commentary for Teaching and Preaching, edited by James Luther Mays, Patrick D. Miller, and Paul J. Achtemeier. Atlanta: John Knox Press, 1983. Pp. vi + 290. \$17.95.

The unique contribution of this commentary lies not in the wealth of its exegetical insights, but in the hermeneutic which informs both it and the series in which it appears. We will concentrate our review, therefore, upon this issue. For what is most valuable about this volume is also most questionable.

The stated purpose of the Interpretation series is to provide contemporary expositions of the biblical literature which takes seriously its historical character while honoring its function as sacred scripture in the church. The

scope of the hermeneutical task is thus established. It involves not only explaining what a text *meant* historically but also suggesting what it *means* presently, the assumption being that there is a material connection between the two. The series thus consciously distinguishes itself from both traditional, historical, critical commentaries and popular homiletical aids to preaching. Preachers and teachers in the church, for whom this *is* the hermeneutical task, will welcome this scholarly effort on their behalf.

Lamar Williamson, Jr., Professor of biblical studies at the Presbyterian School of Christian Education, Richmond, Virginia, pursues this editorial purpose in his own novel way. Assuming the text of the Revised Standard Version, the interpretation is presented in essay fashion, section by section, in accordance with a helpful and convincing outline of the literary structure of the Second Gospel.

That Mark is written as a Gospel (1:1) is taken seriously. The term is understood in a threefold sense: (1) Gospel as Story (literary genre); (2) Gospel as Good News (theological message); and (3) Gospel as Scripture (canonical writing). Each nuance influences the interpretation of Mark, but it is the third sense which shapes the format of the commentary.

There are two foci. Because "scripture" means "what is written," Williamson focuses on the meaning of the text, "not the history behind it" (p. 25). In that "scripture" also means "a writing that is fundamental and normative for a religious community," he also focuses on "the meaning of the text for the life of the church" (p. 26).

The format thus includes "notes on the *text* (what is written) which call attention to the meaning of the passage in its own context and on its own terms," followed by a "section on *significance*" which "seeks to indicate some of the ways in which the passage may function as source, resource, and norm for the life of Christians today" (Ibid.).

Here the influence of the hermeneutical theory of E. D. Hirsch, Jr. (*Validity in Interpretation*, 1967) is evident. For Hirsch, every sensible text expresses the intended meaning of its author. The task of interpretation is to understand (literally, to "stand under" and submit the mind to) the intended authorial meaning. It is to be distinguished, however, from criticism, which seeks to discern through an act of judgment the *significance* (i.e., relevance) of textual *meaning*. Williamson curiously adopts this distinction terminologically

but departs from it materially by combining "text" and "significance" under the rubric of "meaning" and including both within the proper scope of interpretation.

This emphasis upon the Gospel as Scripture, welcome as it is, ultimately in the exposition begs the question of the relationship of the Gospel to history.

Williamson acknowledges that his comments on the text "presuppose no particular judgment about the identity of the evangelist or the place and time of writing or the special character of the community that is addressed" (p. 25). This will raise eyebrows in some quarters. Yet a hermeneutical theorist such as Paul Ricoeur (*Interpretation Theory*, 1976) would agree that the sense of an ancient text is comprehensible quite apart from such considerations, literature being more noetically oriented and less historically conditioned than generally assumed. This, then, is not the problem.

Further, Williamson recognizes that the canonical text of Mark is a source for at least three levels of the history of earliest Christianity: (1) the history of the evangelist and his community; (2) the history of the earlier community which preserved the oral traditions about Jesus; and (3) the history of Jesus and his first disciples (p. 18). His point is that although the second Gospel *can* be used as a source for attempts at reconstructing the history implicit within the text, it need not be so used in order to interpret its meaning. This also is not the issue.

When, however, he immediately adds (rightly) that historical certainty becomes "increasingly problematical" the further one moves from the first level toward the third, the question is raised which cannot be begged. Is the theological message of Mark, which is conveyed by the story of Jesus that is told, undegirded by the actual history of Jesus? If so, then in what sense? If not, then what does this imply about the truth of the Gospel?

Williamson waffles here. He acknowledges the skepticism about the historicity of the Gospel records which has informed research in recent centuries, but he seeks to escape from "the concern for history (what really happened?)" by opting for the growing scholarly consensus that the author of Mark, like all the evangelists, was a "theologian" whose purpose was "not to write history, but to announce a message" (p. 17). Does this mean that the kerygmatic story told by Mark has no essential relationship to the actual history of Jesus? If

so, then the second Gospel may convey literary, even theological, *meaning* but without regard for historical *truth*.

That this is the direction Williamson appears to take is evidenced by his treatment of the so-called "miracles" which are attested in Mark. Acknowledging that these stories are problematical for the modern reader because of the conflict between modern and ancient world views, and recognizing that the modern world view may be inadequate and thus subject to revision, Williamson nevertheless assumes the canonical status of modernity and interprets the "miracle" stories literarily rather than historically. He writes: "The appropriate question is not, 'What really happened?' but 'What did this happening really mean?'" (p. 20). One can only wonder whether these questions can be separated so neatly without the Gospel succumbing to a modern form of Gnosticism.

Williamson exposes himself to this danger by limiting the meaning of the text to "what is written." Ricoeur points out that textual meaning is constituted by both its *sense* (what is written) and its *reference* (what is written about). In other words, the subject matter of discourse transcends the language which bears witness to it. In the case of Mark, the primary subject matter is "Jesus Christ, the Son of God" (1:1). This literary reference, however, is joined to its referent—the Jesus of history who is attested in the Gospel.

This witness character of Mark is recognized in this commentary, but the interpretation would have been strengthened by Ricoeur's exposition of what constitutes a witness (*Essays on Biblical Interpretation*, 1980). It is the product of the witness-to (fact) being combined with the witness-for (interpretation). Here the theological interpretation does not slip the chain of the historical reality which both occasions and tethers it. I remain convinced that this does more justice to the *meaning* of the text of Mark than that advocated by Williamson.

Nevertheless, these critical remarks pertain not to the goal envisioned but to the route to be followed. Those who preach and teach the Bible as sacred scripture will benefit greatly from this thoughtful and helpful commentary on Mark.

THOMAS W. GILLESPIE
Princeton Theological Seminary

Bruce, F. F. *1 & 2 Thessalonians*. Word Biblical Commentary, no. 45. Waco, TX: Word Books, 1982. Pp. 228 + xlvii. n.p.

Once more, ministers and scholars are greeted by a commentary from the pen of Professor F. F. Bruce. This volume on the Thessalonian correspondence exemplifies the kind of careful exegetical work we have come to expect from this distinguished Manchester scholar.

In a 47-page introduction, Bruce lays out the historical background to the letter and deals with general issues of authorship, date, and occasion. In the introduction, as in the commentary proper, Bruce makes extensive use of the book of Acts to establish the setting of the letter, but without imposing it on Paul's own letter; for example, Acts 17:5, which tells of persecution in Thessalonica at the instigation of Jews, is noted at 1 Thessalonians 2:14, but the two instances are not equated since the latter says that the persecution was at the hands of their fellow-Thessalonians. The next section deals with the problems of authorship, date, and occasion of the letter, with reference to many specific proposals from other scholars. This section is made somewhat disjointed by the number of different proposals dealt with and the rather cursory manner in which Bruce responds to them and offers his own solutions; one wishes that he had put forth his own position in a coherent and systematic manner, with occasional reference to other scholars' work, rather than the other way around. But, Bruce does present the reader with the problems surrounding the letters and the variety of solutions proposed for them. His own position is that 1 Thessalonians was written in Corinth sometime around 50 A.D. in response to news from Timothy upon his return to Paul, shortly after Paul and his friends were forced from Thessalonica (Acts 17); 2 Thessalonians followed shortly afterwards as a response to reports of overzealous eschatological fervor in Thessalonica. Bruce thinks that Timothy and Silvanus played a fully responsible part in the writing of the letter because of the frequent occurrence of "we" and the lack of distinctive Pauline theologoumena.

A major problem in the introduction, and with the commentary as a whole, is with the treatment of the authorship of 2 Thessalonians. In the preface, Bruce comments that the greatest difficulties in interpreting this correspondence are those involved with arguments

that 2 Thessalonians is pseudonymous, and then simply remarks, "Both letters are here treated as authentic." While theories of pseudonymity are mentioned again several times in the commentary, Bruce never defends his own position except for the bare assertion in the preface. After a short summary of the pseudonymity theory in the introduction Bruce promises to say more about the authenticity of 2 Thessalonians (p. xxxiv), but one waits in vain for anything beyond parenthetical references. Perhaps Bruce thinks that his suggestion that Paul's co-workers participated in the writing takes care of the objections; or perhaps he thinks that the extended discussion of the relationship between 1 and 2 Thessalonians (pp. xxxix-xlvi) covers the question of the chronological order of the two letters on the assumption that 2 Thessalonians is authentic. It is unfortunate that the most difficult issue in the Thessalonian correspondence (and the most important, as far as 2 Thessalonians is concerned) should receive such short shrift. Professor Bruce is not obligated to take up any particular position, but he does need to present a more systematic defense of his rejection of what is now a widely held opinion. This commentary leaves the impression that doubts about the authenticity of 2 Thessalonians are merely scholarly eccentricities that need not be taken seriously. Moreover, one would expect some explanation of prominent features of 2 Thessalonians missing in other letters, especially the rejoicing in the coming destruction of the wicked in chapter 1 and the dabbling in apocalyptic timetables in chapter 2.

Following the format for the Word series, Bruce divides the commentary proper into six sections for each passage: bibliography, translation, textual notes, form/structure/setting, comment, and explanation. The bibliographies are excellent, covering literature from both Protestants and Catholics, liberals and conservatives, and in at least six modern languages. The explanation section is intended to be a "clear exposition of the passage's meaning and its relevance to the ongoing biblical revelation" (editorial preface). While one can sympathize with the editors' desire to produce commentaries both exegetical and expository, the combination is only moderately successful in this case. The problem lies not in inaccuracies or theological problems in what is said in the explanation sections, but in the fact that they are for the most part repetitions of the com-

ment section in simpler terms and without technical discussion. Thus, the exegete will wonder why the repetition was necessary, and the homiletician will miss the application to modern life. The relationship between scripture and theology is a difficult problem, and it would seem more useful not to combine the two approaches unless one has a carefully thought out understanding of how they interact with each other.

The real strength of the commentary is in the exegetical sections themselves. Bruce combines careful and thorough grammatical analysis of the Greek text with frequent reference to the life and literature of the ancient world. A book review can hardly deal with all the detailed work, but a few examples should illustrate his overall view of the two letters.

Bruce leans towards acceptance of the theory that the anti-Jewish passage 1 Thessalonians 2:15-17 is an interpolation looking back on the fall of Jerusalem, especially in light of the stark contrast of the passage with Romans 11. He shies away from making a definite judgment ("the question . . . remains *sub judice*"), but he finds none of the explanations of what Paul could have meant convincing.

The difficult problem of the phrase *heautou skeuos ktaisthai* in 1 Thessalonians 4:3 Bruce resolves, after examination of biblical and non-biblical usage, in favor of the translation "to gain control over the body," based partly on the depreciatory view of women implicit in the alternative translation "take a wife," which would describe wives as their husbands' "vestsels." Apparently Bruce does not interpret the phrase in an ascetic sense, even as he translates it.

At 2 Thessalonians 2:1-12, Bruce notes that the phrase *di' epistolē hōs di' hēmōn* in 2:2 need not necessarily deny the writer's authorship of the epistle in question, leaving open the possibility that some in Thessalonica had misunderstood 1 Thessalonians. The opponents' slogan, "The Day of the Lord is present," is not realized eschatology, which would not be addressed by the reply in vv. 3-12, but overzealous apocalyptic enthusiasm that has some worried that the Day of the Lord has come, but without resurrection and translation. In response, the author discusses the sequence of events leading up to the end. Bruce supplements his comments on this obscure passage with a very helpful excursus on the history of the idea of the antichrist. Bruce himself thinks that "the restrainer" of 2 Thessalonians 2:6-7

is the Roman Empire (represented by the emperor, thus the neuter and masculine terms) which presently functions to restrain evil (Romans 13) which in the final days will run amuck.

In general, despite the reservations noted, this is a solid commentary that will be useful to student and pastor alike. It is not a groundbreaking work, but given the number of recent commentaries made almost useless by eccentric and ill-considered theses, one cannot be too sorry to see someone writing books with little that is new, but with much that is useful and dependable.

MARK A. PLUNKETT

The Graduate School
Princeton Theological Seminary

Bentley, Jerry H. *Humanists and the Holy Writ; New Testament Scholars in the Renaissance*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1983. Pp. vii + 245. \$23.50.

It has been widely recognized that humanistic studies at the time of the Renaissance exerted a profound influence upon the subsequent Reformation, but somewhat less well known is the detailed influence of this development on the expansion of New Testament scholarship. It is this subject that engages the attention of Jerry Bentley, associate professor of history at the University of Hawaii, who investigates how the newer scholarship changed the questions asked in New Testament studies, the methods used to answer them, and the rules governing the interpretation of data. Instead of dealing in generalities, the author wisely focuses upon several particularly influential humanists and their work in the editing of texts, the production of translations, and the explanation of works edited or translated.

The mainspring of the new movement was the Italian humanist, Lorenzo Valla (died 1457), whose erudite and influential thesaurus *Elegantiae linguae latinae* set forth the meanings, nuances, and proper usage of Latin words. Throughout his life Valla collected instances where the current Latin manuscripts of the New Testament presented an imperfect or erroneous rendering of the underlying Greek text. In some cases he ventured into the domain of textual criticism, choosing among the variant readings, but generally he concentrated on evaluating Jerome's Latin style and

usage. But beyond matters of style, Valla found hundreds of points where he could offer a more accurate translation than that of the Vulgate. Valla's lists of annotations on the New Testament, which he circulated among a small, select group of scholars, were finally published by Erasmus (1505) a half-century after Valla's death.

Next in chronological sequence was the preparation of the Complutensian Polyglot Bible, volume 5 of which contained the first printed edition of the Greek New Testament (1514). Bentley provides an interesting and informative account of the making of the six volumes of this Polyglot Bible, as well as comparing the Greek text with the form of the Latin Vulgate that was printed in parallel columns. Unhappily, despite extensive researches, no one has as yet identified any of the Greek manuscripts that were used in the preparation of the Complutensian Greek New Testament.

The largest section of Bentley's book deals with Erasmus as Christian humanist. In the summer of 1504, while working in the library of the Abbey of Parc, near Louvain, Erasmus came upon a manuscript of Lorenzo Valla's *Annotations* on the New Testament. From that point onward one can trace the development of Erasmus's New Testament scholarship in its characteristic form. In April of the next year he published Valla's *Annotations*, and soon afterward began his own Latin translation of the Greek New Testament. Meanwhile, by 1507 Erasmus saw the need for a reliable text of the Greek New Testament. After several diversions into other areas of scholarship, late in 1512 Erasmus wrote to a friend about his intention to edit the Greek Testament. As is well known, his work came to fruition in 1516 when the first published Greek New Testament came from Froben's press in Basel.

At once Erasmus was confronted with a rising tide of criticisms. At first the attacks centered on the principle of applying philological rules in the interpretation of Biblical texts; these were followed by a scrutiny of individual passages in his edition. Despite his professed reluctance to engage in altercations with his fellow theologians, the list of his *apologiae* kept growing, so that eventually they came to occupy two folio volumes in the Leclerc edition of his *Opera Omnia* (vols. ix and x). Noteworthy among them are the apologies and counter-apologies (about a dozen in all!) issued in quick succession by Erasmus and Diego López de Zúñiga, one of the several

scholars who provided material for the Complutensian Polyglot Bible.

In tracing the course of these controversies, Bentley supplies well-chosen examples that illustrate Erasmus's insights into textual criticism, exegesis, and translation. Throughout the book the author sketches a broad canvas and shows, in fascinating detail, the ongoing development of those methods of textual and literary analysis which laid the foundations for present-day philological scholarship focussed on the New Testament. Besides being instructed by the content of this book, the perceptive reader will also be pleased with the author's lucid and graceful literary style.

BRUCE M. METZGER

Princeton Theological Seminary

Handelman, Susan S. *The Slayers of Moses: The Emergence of Rabbinic Interpretation in Modern Literary Theory*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press, 1982. Pp. xxi + 267. \$12.95.

This is an important book, pertinent for students of biblical as well as nonbiblical literatures and deserving wide attention. Appearing as part of the SUNY series on Jewish literature and culture, the book's primary focus is on the rabbinic tradition. The author argues that the extremely influential hermeneutic revolutions running from Freud through Derrida and Bloom represent and continue distinctively rabbinical methods of interpretation, set opposite a very different Patristic and Reformation approach. In our century, she associates these developments with the "collapse of Christian prestige" and the "increasingly dominant" role of Jewish thinkers (p. xv). Talmudic scholars will of course have to appraise her rabbinical arguments, but as a working literary historian and a practical reader of literary texts and critical interpretations, I am much impressed.

Susan Handelman explicitly disavows membership in any of the contemporary "hermeneutical mafias" (pp. xv-xvii), presumably including those upon which she here concentrates her acute but sympathetic attention. The value of her work consists in her impressive marshalling of structural affinities between rabbinic modes of interpretation and the representative critical theorists she treats, critics who have had a far-reaching influence on practices in reading many kinds of texts.

Freud is the most famous figure among those Handelman discusses, but Jacques Derrida may be even more symptomatic. As she sees it, "Freud, the assimilated Jew struggling with two cultures, Hebrew and Hellene, reenacts the drama of displacement in his psyche and his work, combining rabbinism and German science in a project to murder and usurp Moses with the new gospel of psychoanalysis. Derrida much more unabashedly proclaims his intention to 'deconstruct' the entire Western tradition of 'onto-theology' and 'logocentrism' by crucifying the word and sending it into a dissemination of exile, gleefully proclaiming a new liberation in this overthrow of the idols" (pp. 137f.). Handelman characterizes this Derridean strategy "to attack the European psyche and the Holy logos, to attempt to overturn Western man from within and without" as representing "an act of revenge by the exiles—and yet again a defense of the Jewish father" (p. 177). If, as she argues, Freud replaced the reading and interpretation of Scripture with a comparable reading and reinterpretation of the past and dreams, Derrida's replacement is even more radical: "not simply an overthrow of Western metaphysics, but a subtle subversion of the possibility of any thought outside his own" (p. 166). By "concocting a mystifying nonterminology, which at every instant eludes definition," Derrida in effect turns reading and interpretation into an "infinitely self-reflective" exercise on the critic's part, a strategy which can obviously minimize or even destroy literature as an independent object of attention. According to Handelman, we are saved from that ultimate decomposition of literature because the critic "must defer his own questions, or else his radical attack on origins and the book would lead to his own dissolution and silence" (pp. 174-177). As a matter of simple self-preservation, there is a point where Derridean-style critics must draw back from an ultimate deconstruction of *all* meaning only because such a deconstruction would also undercut the value of their own critical expressions.

That contradiction between hermeneutic principle and personal or professional need reveals one major weakness in this methodology, and in my view it connects with another even more basic difficulty: the interpretative strategies which Handelman studies place interpretation on the same plane with the primary text. Elevating exegesis to equal status with "scripture" (whether biblical or Shake-

spearean, for example) tends to reduce the scripture in question to a subordinate status, subject to the cultural fashions and personal biases of readers who are bright enough to work their wills upon it. To illustrate the point, it is apparent that only one person could and did write *Hamlet*, but a great many critics would like to "rewrite" it, and in effect have attempted to do so, thereby leaving it a lesser work. The same thing can happen to the Torah, of which Gershon Scholem writes: "Itself without meaning, it is the very essence of interpretability" (p. 205). Even when the text is denied valid meaning(s), it is held that valid meaning can still be found in interpretation, or in the interpretation of interpretation—an assumption which patently undercuts itself.

Any literary text, whether great or small, can be made fair game for such interpretations, and "strong readers" can treat the most seminal (as also the most sterile) works of any culture as though they were noses of wax to be molded into new shapes, regardless of *pes-hat* or plain reading, so that any *midrash* is potentially as valid as any other. Harold Bloom, one of the principal subjects of this book, thus virtually insists on the need for "misprision," a term which Handelman defines as "purposeful misinterpretation" or "necessary misreading and reinterpretation of the precursor text" (pp. 138, 185, 189).

On that basis, the function of each strong critic is not to bring out as nearly as possible some inherent meaning(s) of a text, but to slay and displace Moses the author (in Freud's terms) and to perform a misprision on Moses' text (in Bloom's terms). As Handelman argues, "the passion to replace origins [is] the Jewish heretic hermeneutic," and in that replacement she views the "'heretical' as a truly 'normative' part of Jewish history" (pp. 177, 199). She observes that "the elevation of later commentary to the status of earlier primary text is one of the extraordinary characteristics of rabbinic interpretation," so that the Torah has been continually subject to "revolution from within" (pp. 41f.). Thus the early rabbinical fathers whose comments on Scripture were brought together in the Mishnah in about 200-220 were further interpreted and reinterpreted in the Gemara by the Amoraim (c. 200-500) in what she calls "a Mishnah on the Mishnah" which became the Talmud, upon which later commentary produced "in fact, a Talmud on the Talmud," as "commentary and exegesis of the Torah attain the same status as Torah" (pp. 46, 202).

In the last pages of her own text Handelman writes movingly of this rabbinical tradition as the effort of a broken people "trying somehow to make the facts of their historical catastrophe agree with the exalted promises of their Sacred Book. And this can be accomplished only through feats of subtle interpretive reversal" (p. 223). For the major critics whom she treats as heirs of this tradition, "there is no end of exile for Bloom—or for Derrida—or for Freud." Thus, "in reaction to a Scripture that endlessly promises but never fulfills, and a God whose absence must suffice for presence, they will make of their exile an antithetical promised land, a 'Criticism in the Wilderness,' to use Geoffrey Hartman's term" (p. 222).

Because for the Jews "divinity is located in language, not person," Handelman sees it as the eminently Jewish stance that "instead of Incarnation is Interpretation" (pp. 89, 140). In direct contrast, "Christianity replaces the endless discourses of Rabbinic interpretation with the decisive act of presence: incarnation" (p. 193). That last sentence goes straight to the heart of the tragic division between these two peoples of the Book, but when she attempts to move from that point into the development and ramification of traditional Christian hermeneutics she is less well prepared and thus less perceptive.

As an organizing device, she early refers to the opposition between rabbinic interpretation and Patristic thought-systems (pp. xv, xix). Unfortunately, her citations of the Church Fathers (often scanty, and at several removes) and her discussions with them evidence only minimal contact. Her presentations of Christian doctrine are so poorly informed that they sometimes appear indistinguishable from two early and mortal heresies: Marcion's rejection of the whole Old Testament, and Docetism's insistence upon a "spiritual" and unhistorical incarnation. As for the "Greek" influence on the early church, her primary attention is upon Aristotle, with only a few side glances at Plato. But even that oversimplification is less damaging than her apparent unawareness of the actual shape of the classical *paideia* of late Hellenic and Roman culture in the generations between Paul and Augustine, which was heavily religious, poetical, and (in the early sense) rhetorical. Because of weaknesses such as these, she is unable to speak effectively about the crucially divergent developments of Jewish and Christian interpretation. To claim to interpret a polarity in which she is only marginally fa-

miliar with one pole can only be viewed as a mistake, but it is not a fatal one, because the strength of this book is its treatment of rabbinical developments and influences.

Despite my obvious reservations, I find Handelman's book one of the most stimulating and informative treatments of literary theory which I have read in many years, and I strongly recommend it.

ROLAND MUSHAT FRYE

University of Pennsylvania
Philadelphia, PA

Palma, Robert J. *Karl Barth's Theology of Culture: The Freedom of Culture for the Praise of God*. Allison Park, PA: Pickwick Publications, 1983. Pp. x + 122. \$10.00.

The idea of a "theology of culture" is frequently associated in America with the work of Paul Tillich. It is commonly understood as the attempt to bring to light the depth dimension or the religious element in all cultural activity. So conceived, the project of a theology of culture and the theology of Karl Barth seem utterly incompatible.

Robert J. Palma, professor of religion at Hope College, argues that Barth does indeed offer a theology of culture although it is quite different from Tillich's and does not neatly fit into any of the conventional types of a theology of culture as presented, for example, in H. Richard Niebuhr's *Christ and Culture*.

Palma thinks it is possible to discern a descriptive, a critical, and a constructive theology of culture in Barth's writings. He traces the development of Barth's views from the early period of dialectic to the period of Christocentric concentration in which the *analogia fidei* and the *analogia relationis* play an increasingly decisive role.

"Game" and "play" are Barth's persistent metaphors for culture. In an early essay he writes: "Art and science, business and politics, techniques and education are really a game—a serious game, but a game, and game means an imitative and ultimately ineffectual activity—the significance of which lies not in its attainable goals but in what it signifies. And the game [may] actually be played better and more successfully, the more it [is] recognized as a game."

In a much later essay, Barth describes culture as simply the endeavor of human beings

to be human, to honor and to make use of the freedom and responsibility which are God's gifts. Barth finds the foundation of culture in the free grace of God, and he sees the humanity of Christ as the critical and constructive norm of what Palma calls "the freedom of culture for the praise of God." Culture can, of course, be perverted and even put to monstrous ends, but the cultural drive in humanity is by no means inherently evil. To be sure, culture for Barth is never a way of salvation nor an avenue of revelation alongside the Word of God. Still, at its finest—Barth's favorite paradigm of free culture was the music of Mozart—culture is the expression of the freedom, creativity, and playfulness of humanity, and it may offer signs, parables, or analogies of the Kingdom of God decisively revealed in Jesus Christ.

Palma's assessment of Barth's *sui generis* theology of culture is sympathetic but not uncritical. A Reformed theologian himself, he is in general agreement with those reservations about Barth's theology articulated by Dutch Reformed theologians such as G. C. Berkouwer. Palma contends that, in the final analysis, Barth failed to take with sufficient seriousness both the intrinsic value of culture and its evil potential. He also claims that Barth's attempt to move by way of Christocentric analogy from the light of the gospel to directives for Christian witness in the social and political spheres is simplistic and needs to be refined by the construction of "middle axioms" which mediate between the gospel and the concrete human situation in different times and places.

While brief and compactly written, Palma's work is a helpful orientation to a large, insufficiently explored, and frequently misunderstood topic in Barth's theology. However, this reviewer's appreciation is coupled with several questions. First, Palma underestimates the very positive and liberating meaning of Barth's metaphors of game and play for culture seen in the light of the gospel. As a result, Palma proposes that we speak instead of the "mandate" of Christian culture. In this significant shift of metaphors, he unintentionally obscures Barth's insistence that gospel precedes law, that God's gift (*Gabe*) is the presupposition of the task (*Aufgabe*) of culture.

Moreover, Palma asserts rather than argues that the elaboration of "middle axioms" in social and political ethics is less susceptible to the charges of arbitrariness and suppressed presuppositions often leveled against Barth's

use of analogies grounded in the central message of the Bible. If Barth's political reasoning was as unreliable and culture-bound as his critics imply, one might at least pause to wonder why he stood in the vanguard of the criticism of Nazism, the dark side of advanced capitalism, the ugly expressions of Western as well as Eastern imperialism, and the deadly logic of militarism, whereas some of his fellow theologians who considered his approach to culture—and to politics in particular—naïve in the extreme, lagged behind.

Finally, Palma's work is surprisingly silent about Barth's theology of man and woman. If culture has to do not only with arts and sciences but also with patterns of social relationship, the relation of man and woman is surely an important aspect of any theology of culture. Unfortunately, this is an area in which Barth's use of analogy is indeed seriously flawed.

DANIEL L. MIGLIORE
Princeton Theological Seminary

Barth, Karl. *The Theology of Schleiermacher: Lectures at Göttingen*. Edited by Dietrich Ritschl. Translated by Geoffrey W. Bromiley. Grand Rapids, MI: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1982. \$13.95.

This text offers to English readers Karl Barth's Göttingen lectures of 1923/24 on the theology of nineteenth century theologian Friedrich Schleiermacher. Barth began these lectures "prepared for something bad" and concluded by telling his thirty-some students that he found Schleiermacher an even more foreboding "distortion of Protestant theology" than he anticipated. In the Schleiermacher he portrays in these lectures, Barth perceives a wrathful judgment of God on Protestantism. He sees little remedy except for "a theological revolution, a basic No to the whole of Schleiermacher's doctrine of religion and Christianity" (pp. 259-260).

As readers of Barth know, however, Barth's relation to Schleiermacher is rife with more ambiguity than his thunderous *Nein!* advises. This text is ample testimony to the respect and even awe which Barth always held for Schleiermacher. In his youth, he "knew how to swear no higher than by the man, Daniel Ernst Friedrich Schleiermacher" (p. 261). In his later years, Barth could still cultivate a tentative spirit, asking, "Could he not perhaps

be understood differently so that I would not have to reject his theology, but rather might be joyfully conscious of proceeding in fundamental agreement with him?" (p. 275).

In these lectures readers glimpse both the profound respect and also the persistent suspicion that Barth brought to his study of Schleiermacher. The respect is displayed in the very care with which Barth seeks to exposit Schleiermacher's corpus of writings. Barth begins with a treatment of the nineteenth century church father's sermons—the sermons of Advent and Lent together with his "household sermons" on marriage, family, and community life. Barth's discussion of the sermons fills over half of this volume and he skillfully comments on them as a context for considering Schleiermacher's philosophical and theological work. The latter half of the book then is given to discussion of Schleiermacher's *Brief Outline on the Study of Theology*, his hermeneutics, and his major work, *The Christian Faith*. Pressed for time, Barth concludes the lectures with a brief sixteen pages on Schleiermacher's *On Religion*.

Barth's exposition of these respected writings is, as I have already signaled, not offered without pronouncing his suspicions. In these lectures, however, explicit disagreements are limited to occasional parenthetical remarks, excurses, or brief concluding summaries. Thus, Barth's exposition of the Christmas and Easter sermons ends with only a brief statement on the "disquietude" with which Schleiermacher's christology fills him (p. 103). He discerns here "intolerable humanizing of Christ." In his expositions of the household sermons, it is clear that Barth views with great discomfort Schleiermacher's suggestions that propagation of the divine word may rest on human marriage (p. 109). When summarizing Schleiermacher's *Brief Outline*, Barth laments briefly that the author leaves no place for zealous "meditation on the Word of God" (p. 173). Commentary on Schleiermacher's general hermeneutics is rallied around Barth's question: "Is there not a special New Testament hermeneutics?" (p. 183).

Barth's discussion of Schleiermacher's *The Christian Faith* gives a short survey of the whole text, and then focuses mainly on the "Introduction" to the book in which differences between Barth and Schleiermacher are especially striking. It is perhaps here that Barth allows his suspicion most to affect his exposition of Schleiermacher's texts. Barth hardly considers

it necessary to lead his listeners through the body of *The Christian Faith*. According to Barth, the *true* content of Schleiermacher's dogmatics is in the "Introduction." For the content is determined, according to the "Introduction," by disciplines that view Christianity from the outside (p. 211). Thus Barth chooses to ignore Schleiermacher's own claim, expressed in letters to G. C. F. Lücke, that his "Introduction" was mere portal to his dogmatics' true content. Nor is Barth satisfied by Schleiermacher's claim that he considered placing the "Introduction" after the book's main content.

The editors of this fine collection also include at the end of their volume a "Concluding Unscientific Postscript on Schleiermacher," translated by George Hunsinger from a 1968 collection of writings on Schleiermacher. This Postscript is a fitting conclusion to these lectures, giving us Barth's own description of his lifelong struggle with Schleiermacher. Here is where Barth articulates most clearly both his great admiration *and* also his suspicion of Schleiermacher. These two forces often seem equally strong in Barth and even suggest an eventual compromise or rapprochement: "the door is in fact not latched."

Barth goes on to explain in this Postscript, however, what factors kept the door closed throughout his life. These factors are set forth compactly in the form of five dialectically structured questions that Barth puts to Schleiermacher. These questions disclose dramatically the mind of Barth when approaching Schleiermacher—a mind that subjects material to a series of powerful either/or demands. Schleiermacher's work must be *either* necessarily oriented to worship, preaching, and pastoral care *or* to a philosophy. Schleiermacher's view of the human person is discussed as *either* related to an indispensable Other, an object superior in every way to human being, feeling, willing, *or* related to a sovereign world consciousness. Schleiermacher's texts are treated as *either* relating persons to reality that is primarily concrete *or* relating them to reality apprehended first as general and abstract. Barth clearly displays his predilection for the first pole of these dialectical alternatives, while laying out the difficulties he sees in the other pole around which he sees Schleiermacher's theology organized. It is Barth's propensity for such either/or formulations when interpreting Schleiermacher that gives some grounds for suspecting that his critiques elucidate Barth more than they do Schleiermacher.

This book of lectures, therefore, provides in English translation another source for scholars of Barth's relation to Schleiermacher. This will probably be its primary value. The book is not best used as summary exposition of *The Christian Faith, On Religion*, or of his hermeneutical manuscripts. His summary of Schleiermacher's *Brief Outline* is more thorough and a helpful discussion of the reciprocal relations between philosophical, historical, and practical theology according to Schleiermacher. Perhaps Barth's analysis of Schleiermacher's sermons here will be most valuable for many readers, showing how the churchman's preaching bears the marks of the grander theology he elaborated.

MARK KLINE TAYLOR
Princeton Theological Seminary

Boer, Harry R. *The Doctrine of Reprobation in the Christian Reformed Church*. Grand Rapids, MI: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1983. Pp. 86. \$4.95 (paper).

Dr. Harry Boer's book, *The Doctrine of Reprobation in the Christian Reformed Church*, is not for everyone. It is not hard to imagine some who would question the wisdom or even the sanity of anyone who would write on such an obscure issue in today's world. In a world filled with tension between the super powers, war in so many parts of the world, high employment, global injustice, and the threat of nuclear holocaust hanging over everyone's head, how can anyone, much less a spokesperson for the church, spend time on an issue that seems so antiquated? Isn't the question of reprobation similar to the question of how many angels can dance on the head of a pin? That is, aren't both questions a throwback to an age of speculative scholasticism or, at best, mere rationalism?

Others will hardly recognize the subject matter. The broader evangelical community is not noted for its interest in the weightier issues of theology much less an item that could be considered as abstract theology. One need only peruse the bookshelves of most Christian bookstores to note a real dearth of books on systematic theology, doctrine, or solid biblical/theological studies. Many within this group would respond with cries of "Let's keep the message simple—such as 'God loves you,' or 'are you saved.'" What we need are books to stir up people to get actively involved in the

spreading of the Good News and not books which are divisive, or too complicated, or quite simply irrelevant.

Even within his own Reformed community, Dr. Boer doesn't seem to have an audience for his concern. If his analysis of the CRC is true (see pp. 77-80) in that it is composed of a right and left wing with a majority of people in the center, and if such a picture holds true for the broader Reformed community, then it is interesting and instructive to hear why he feels he cannot get a fair hearing even in this community. Boer writes:

With a flabby center and a too-cautious left, the right, which can least of all be charged with flabbiness or over-caution is pursuing its hold-the-line policy, has been far more influential than either its numbers or its competence warrants. It stands on the rock called The Form of Subscription and calls to severe account those who seem to venture from it. It does so with the amorality characteristic of all subscription. Does it not know that reprobation is disbelieved on all sides? Does it not know that, barring exceptions, it plays no role in the teaching, preaching, pastoral, and apologetic ministry of the Christian Reformed Church? Other, that is, than making the church's whole ministerial and professional cadre double-hearted and double-tongued. Assuredly, it does, but it is not concerned about this duplicity. What it wants and is content with is *legal conformity to* and a show of *formal compliance with* the Form of Subscription. It is content with public silence on the part of dissenting minds. The center and, in higher degree, the left, while not "content" with this, not only tolerates it but consciously and without protest cooperates with the universal game that keeps the CRC "orthodox." The orthodoxy that is thus maintained is a political orthodoxy in the sense that it is the result of give and take that goes far beyond the legitimate forms of compromise by which all in the church of Christ and indeed in all human society must receive one another. It is an orthodoxy with respect to predestination that is based on fear, insincerity, and violence to conscience, and all this on a massive scale. Scripture calls this "quenching the spirit," but the CRC calls it "orthodoxy" (pp. 78-79).

If Dr. Boer cannot get a hearing within his own Reformed community, whatever prompted

him to write a book on a subject that few others outside of that community could understand or be sympathetic towards? Before some attempt is made to answer that question, let's hear why the book was written and what the book has to say.

The book was written for the church. By church, one might assume the one holy catholic church of which all true believers are members. In particular, however, the book is addressed to all those denominations whose life and doctrine are subject to creedal and/or confessional allegiances. Dr. Boer reminds such churches that though consistories, classes, and synods are the appointed stewards over the creeds of the church, these governing bodies are not owners of the creeds/confessions. The creeds/confessions belong to the church and therefore, the church has a right and a responsibility to know how such creeds are to be understood and whether or not new interpretations are being imposed upon such creeds apart from a legitimate and general consent to do so. It is Dr. Boer's contention that his gravamen sought to bring about "necessary change in the confessional life of the CRC." His request was that the doctrine of reprobation as taught by the Canons of Dort be "excised from or become a nonbinding part of the creeds of the Christian Reformed Church" (Introduction, p. 8). Dr. Boer writes concerning the response he received: "This book tells the story of the theological argumentation and the ecclesiastical procedures that led to the unqualified rejection of my petition by the Synod of 1980 and the reaffirmation of that rejection by the Synod of 1981. The story that I have to relate is not an edifying one" (Introduction, p. 8).

First, Dr. Boer seeks to place the present discussion of reprobation within a given framework, both historically and ecclesiastically. To those unfamiliar with the history of the Christian Reformed Church, this sketch may be insufficient. For those who do know this history, Dr. Boer's points of reference are helpful in seeing this issue as part and parcel of a particular church's ongoing struggle with key doctrinal issues. The highlighting of the past track record within the CRC in dealing with doctrinal controversy is instructive (pp. 59-60). Given that track record one senses that the way in which the church dealt with Dr. Boer's gravamen came as no real surprise to him.

When the way was finally opened for Dr. Boer to submit his gravamen to a church who

in principle said it would fairly *examine* and *judge* the matter, the reader needs to know that this open door was no small achievement in the history of the CRC. Could it be that the CRC was ready to openly discuss difficult and even controversial issues? Was there now a legitimate way and an appropriate forum to address oneself to issues that trouble the conscience and heart of sincere believers? Could this discussion take place without the fear of quick or hasty judgments of heresy? Was the church really ready to openly struggle with the difficult question of what is the relationship between legitimate academic freedom or the pursuit of theological inquiry and the restrictions of creedal and confessional statements? Dr. Boer had hoped the answer would be yes. The book is his way of telling us that the answer was no.

Dr. Boer does more than simply state that the door that appeared to be open was slammed in his face. He very concisely sets forth the key issue. He writes:

The issue in weighing and assessing all these considerations is only and exclusively this: *Is the doctrine of reprobation true?* Does it reflect a God-ordained and God-effected reality? Whether with few words or many words; whether in elaborate exposition or simple statement; whether in point for point antithetic correspondence; whether as a separate decree or as a companion decree or as the negative side of one and the same decree—the central, essential issue is this: Has God from eternity destined some form of humankind never, never to be able to believe the gospel? Does Scripture teach a decree whereby a massive segment of history . . . is consigned to damnation before they ever come into being? To this question Dort's answer is an unqualified Yes. To this same question the answer of the gravamen is an unqualified No (p. 17).

He then goes on to show how in his mind the committee failed to address itself to the key issues. He felt that the committee in effect changed the rules of the game but continued to call it the same game. On top of all this, there is the concern that from a church polity point of view as well as from the perspective of simple fairness and justice, this whole matter was poorly if not unethically dealt with. Boer writes: "What more could I have wished, therefore, that was not given? One thing, and one thing only, without which the entire pro-

cedure became a mockery: the life-breath of integrity, the honesty of genuine effort to consider and weigh the complaint of the aggrieved party" (p. 63).

Because I am a son of the CRC, I am familiar with much of this history. Being a minister within the CRC, the name of Harry Boer is not unfamiliar. I must confess that often his name has been spoken of under a shadow or cloud of suspicion. Dr. Boer has been likened to one who is forever making trouble in an otherwise peaceful neighborhood. It is as if Dr. Boer goes out of his way to pick a fight over an issue that none want to discuss, much less fight over. It is as if there is a conspiracy in the neighborhood with everyone agreeing simply to ignore the troublemaker and maybe he will go away.

As I reflect on this image and as I am reminded of how many people will very likely pass over this book, I cannot help but be both saddened by the bad boy image and disappointed by all those barriers to overcome in order to get someone to read the book. With all these strikes against the book, why would anyone want to read it?

First, the book should be read by those who sense the importance of grounding our faith and practice in the Word of God. Dr. Boer drives home in an instructive and loving way the importance of dealing aright with the Scriptures. Those who see the hermeneutical question at the very center of the issues, problems, and challenges facing the church today will be encouraged by the probing and honest questions of Dr. Boer.

Second, the book should be read by those who are concerned by and maybe frustrated with the inability or even unwillingness of the church to openly discuss issues which are of importance. We hear the charge so often that many people are theologically illiterate, or, that theology seems to be the special domain of only the specialist in academia. If the church is going to vibrantly and knowingly confess and profess its faith, should it hide from the fact that it will have to continually wrestle anew with its confessional statements? It must work to make them as understandable as possible. It must speak where Scripture speaks and it must learn to be silent when Scripture is silent. Dr. Boer is asking the church to make good on its promise to provide a legitimate context in which such issues can be discussed openly without the axe of theological heresy hanging over people's heads.

Third, the book is an interesting and helpful case study of how important it is for a confessional church to face the issue of confessional integrity. If the creeds and/or confessions of the church are of such a nature that they govern and give direction to the life of the church, then certainly the church should be able to give wholehearted endorsement to such teachings. If Boer's accusation is correct, namely, that the doctrine of reprobation is not believed (p. 76) and in fact "the doctrine of reprobation is regarded by the great majority of those who have some knowledge in the matter as an ecclesiastical and theological nuisance . . ." (p. 76), then does not integrity demand of us to remove such a teaching from a formula of subscription that binds the heart and consciences of many within Reformed circles?

The indifferent formalistic signing of the Form of Subscription must come to an end. The subscription farce may not continue. If this can continue with the greatest equanimity in the headship of the church and of its academic community, think you, honest reader, that this virus will not infect the entire body? Will not this playing fast and loose with the intentions, promises, and commitments expressed in ordination vows and professional academic obligations ere long influence the value attached to marriage vows, contracts, oaths, engagements, and other undertakings in the life of the laity?

Whether one agrees with the conclusions drawn by Dr. Boer relative to the teaching of the Canons, it is extremely unfortunate that his legitimate concerns were dealt with in the way that they were. It is never easy for a family to let other relatives and friends in on a family argument. Yet here is a situation in which the argument is an important one, not only for the wellbeing of one family, namely the CRC, but for that family that makes up the church of our Lord.

The book is short and easy to read, thanks to a very clear and concise setting forth of key issues. The book does not appear to be a candidate for the best seller list, and in fact has many strikes against it by the very nature of the subject matter.

However, the book should be read by everyone who desires to hear the complaint of one who has not received a fair and just hearing. It certainly needs to be read by those within

the Christian Reformed Church and the broader Reformed community in order to confess that we are guilty of theological/confessional double talk, or otherwise to address ourselves to the legitimate questions raised by Dr. Boer. Silence, even the silence of not seeking to become informed, may turn out to be a costly mistake.

DANIEL DE GROOT

Moltmann, Jürgen. *The Power of the Powerless: The Word of Liberation for Today*. San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1983. Pp. 176. \$12.95.

This volume consists, in the main, of sermons preached during the last decade by Moltmann at university services in the Stiftskirche in Tübingen. There are two non-sermonic lectures at the end of the book, but they appear to have been added as an editorial afterthought. This is essentially a *preaching* collection and a rare glimpse of the theologian pressing beyond analysis and description toward proclamation. "The aim of a sermon," writes Moltmann in the preface to this work, "is not merely to make a statement. Sermons are also meant to communicate something that has been experienced."

One is tempted, then, to expect from this book a "popularized" Moltmann or, to put it more crassly, "Moltmann with illustrations." To expect such would, on the one hand, be unfair to the passion for communication and the biting pertinence of Moltmann's formal theological work, and would, on the other hand, be an unrealistic imposition of an American preaching form upon a European context. The chapters in this book are, to be sure, sermons, but American readers will find them more like creative theological essays than examples of popular preaching. These sermons are based upon biblical texts, they were delivered in the context of worship, and they mediate between the ancient testimony and the contemporary situation. And yet, for the most part they do not exhibit the sort of gem-like clarity or depth-cloaked-in-simplicity found in some of Tülich's better sermons. Moltmann's sermons are much more straightforwardly analytical, much less narrative and more discursive, more addressed to the visible world of politics than to the hidden world of "self."

That is not to say that these sermons are devoid of aesthetic appeal or rhetorical finesse.

It would be hard to imagine a more apt image than, "Liberation comes on limping, human feet, for it is liberation by the human God and not by inhuman idols" (p. 18). Or again, listen to the memorable language Moltmann employs to describe Gethsemane:

I believe that it was a quite different fear which laid hold of Christ here and lacerated his soul. It was the fear that he, the only begotten Son, who loved the Father as no one had ever loved before, could be "forsaken," "rejected," even "cursed" by that Father. He is not afraid for his life. He is afraid for God. He is afraid for the Father's kingdom, whose joy he had proclaimed to the poor.

This *suffering from God himself* is the real torment in Christ's passion. This godforsakenness is the cup which he is not spared. God's terrible silence in response to Christ's prayer in Gethsemane is more than a deathly stillness. It is echoed in the dark night of the soul, in which everything that makes life something living withers away, and in which hope vanishes (p. 117).

Another example of provocative sermonic style can be found in Moltmann's sermon "The Pharisee and the Tax Collector," in which the listener is invited to move through the parable in "scenes," each scene building toward the denouement of both parable and sermon.

But what one finds most of all in the volume is not homiletical polish and craft, but rather a keen theological mind, passionately committed to justice, wrestling with biblical texts and producing exciting insights. Moltmann self-consciously assumes the vantage point of the "powerless" in our time, and from this perspective he is able to *see* aspects of the texts which would otherwise have remained "hidden from the strong." From the Pentecost story comes the bold assertion that "there is enough for everyone" and that the experience of the Spirit "is the feast of a life that no longer knows any way." From the "New Covenant" passage in Jeremiah Moltmann discovers the promise that

... we shall all know God, "from the least to the greatest." No one is too great, no one is too small. No one has to look up to anyone. No one has to look down on anyone. Great or small, man or woman, black or white, handicapped or non-handicapped—

where God is known, the differences disappear and the democracy of the Holy Spirit begins (p. 46).

The theological themes present here—hope, suffering, the power of “powerless” love—are all familiar to readers of *The Crucified God* and *The Trinity and the Kingdom*. What is valuable is to see these theological strands emerging from particular biblical texts and seeing them woven into the fabric of specific cultural events. “The sermon stands,” claims Moltmann, “between text and act,” between Bible and mission, and these sermons are poised in just that mediating position.

When the New Covenant envisioned by Jeremiah is realized, “sermons will be superfluous,” asserts Moltmann. “No one will have to preach them and no one will have to listen to them.” Until that time, however, these sermons will serve as excellent models of the liberating power of the biblical Word in a world in which the experience of powerlessness is the order of the day.

THOMAS G. LONG
Princeton Theological Seminary

Gutierrez, Gustavo. *The Power of the Poor in History*. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books, 1983. Pp. iii + 240. \$10.95 (paper).

Ten years ago, Orbis Books made Gustavo Gutierrez's *A Theology of Liberation* available to the English-speaking public. As a result of the publication of that book, Latin American theology of liberation claimed our attention as a serious reinterpretation of the Christian faith and possibly as a new theological paradigm.

Now Orbis has made it possible for Gutierrez to speak to us again, with the translation and publication of this collection of essays. This book, I believe, will make an equally significant contribution to us, in spite of the fact that, as a collection of essays written over a decade, it is somewhat repetitious and not systematic.

What the author has to say here is as important for and as accessible to those who have a limited knowledge of theology in general and of liberation theology in particular, as it is for those who have read widely in this area.

For the first group, the first section, consisting of four chapters, is well worth the price of the book. It opens with a lecture given by Gutierrez in a summer school for priests, nuns,

and lay people in Lima. Here we have what I consider to be one of the clearest and most compelling statements of what the theology of liberation is all about. In it, the systematic theologian who lives in dialogue with the people has moved beyond the abstract conceptualizing of the academicians. His language is more concrete and descriptive, much closer to human experience. It is also closer to the thought and language of the Bible and of many lay Christians today.

The other chapters in this section not only develop further some of the central themes mentioned in the first; they also trace the development of liberation theology in relation to the history of Roman Catholicism in Latin America and to the political and economic developments taking place in that part of the world over the last two decades.

Those who make the effort to enter this Latin American world of life and thought will realize that they are exploring a new movement of the Spirit, a direct consequence of the re-discovery of God's concern for the poor and of the decision of many Christians to live in solidarity with them. As they do this—and continue to read their Bibles—the traditional theological language becomes the bearer of a new message. Salvation is liberation; the Incarnation means “God become poor”; to believe means to love God by living in solidarity with the poor. And out of this new life of faith, a new church is being born—the Church of the Poor, in which those “outside of history” are moving to the center of it.

We may begin reading these essays expecting to learn more about a theology quite foreign to us. But before we put the book down, we may find ourselves addressed and take a new look at what is happening to people around us in the light of our faith.

For those with theological training who are well acquainted with liberation theology, this book can enrich our thought in at least three areas:

1. In it, Gutierrez provides us with an opportunity to see and reflect upon the developments that have taken place in Latin American theology over the last ten years. As the theme of the poor has come to be the dominant one, several things have happened. Professional theologians have felt compelled to live in dialogue with the poor and, to their surprise, have begun to learn from them. In this encounter they have been forced to take more seriously what they have said about the “right

of the poor to think." In dialogue with the poor, they have also been pushed much further in their reinterpretation of traditional theological categories.

Of no less importance, their option for the poor in situations of extreme repression has not only put them in close contact with the "crucifixion of the poor" but has also exposed them as well to the risks of suffering and martyrdom. In Gutierrez's words, "rarely have so many deaths enriched a people and a church with such life." Once again, the Bible is being read by the theologians and the poor under the shadow of the cross. The intellectual is doing his/her theological thinking while involved with the poor in their struggle for liberation. Together they are articulating and living out "a new way of being human and Christian in Latin America today."

2. Rome, as well as many bishops in Latin America, has been disturbed by this movement toward the poor and the emergence of the Church of the Poor in the basic ecclesial communities. Their efforts to check these developments centered around the Conference of Latin American Bishops held in Puebla in 1979. In preparation for it, conservative forces in the church wrote a preliminary document, which was widely circulated and raised a storm of criticism. At Puebla, the debates were intense, but the conservatives were unable to stem the tide. The conference in fact ended up stating clearly the commitment of the bishops to a "preferential option for the poor" for the next decade.

Gustavo Gutierrez played a major role in this struggle. His trenchant critique of the preliminary document was much discussed and his theological work provided a solid foundation for those committed to liberation. In this volume, he invites us to participate in the discussion as we reflect on his critique of the preliminary document (presented here in a condensed version) as well as a longer piece assessing what happened at Puebla.

3. In two concluding chapters, the author discusses the relation between liberation theology in Latin America and modern theological developments in Europe. He reveals a rich knowledge of and deep appreciation for the contributions made by Protestant theologians, especially Barth and Bonhoeffer. But he is primarily concerned to show why a "breach" is necessary. The main thrust of his argument is that theologians on the two continents face different interlocutors. Europeans are trying

to answer the question of non-believers: How to speak of God in a world come of age. The Latin Americans are dealing with the question posed by the existence of so many oppressed poor people: How to proclaim God as Father in a world that is inhumane. We are not living in Latin America. But the issue raised here is one with which we too will have to struggle sooner or later. I know of no one better able to challenge our thinking about it than Gustavo Gutierrez.

These essays take on greater importance for us as US relations with Central and South America continue to deteriorate and as we face mounting attacks on liberation theology in this country. For Gustavo Gutierrez makes it abundantly clear to us that liberation theology in Latin America is above all a powerful spiritual movement, not a disguise for Marxist ideology, and that the emergence of the poor in the base communities now represents the most powerful revolutionary force in that part of the world.

RICHARD SHAULL

Princeton Theological Seminary

Parrish-Harra, Carol W. *A New Age Handbook on Death & Dying*. Marina del Rey, CA: Devores & Company, Publishers, 1982. Pp. 138. \$5.95 (paper).

I must admit that, after first reading this little book, I was not well disposed to give it a favorable review. My first impression was that this was another "self-help" cookbook with a rather upbeat and "mystical" flavor. I have generally found books of this style to be rather poorly organized, which this one is, and mostly filled with rather facile and simplistic formulas steeped in the mysteries of reincarnation, out-of-body experiences, and descriptions of the visitations of spirits.

This book, indeed, contains descriptions of the existence of "three angelic beings" that can be seen attending a person's death (pp. 7-8), the near-death, out-of-body experience of the author (chapter twelve), and cites "scientific" evidence for the reality of reincarnation. There does not appear to be any clear organization of the book as each chapter appears able to stand independently from the others (with the exception of chapters four and five where the author paraphrases the work of Kübler-Ross). In addition, do not expect to find some of the major works in death, dying, and grieving

cited. The reader will not find one mention of Weisman, Lindemann, Mills, or Tolstoy, though Kübler-Ross and Jackson are used to make several points. In all fairness to the author it is her expressed intention to avoid much theorizing and rather to speak out of personal experience. This she does.

The author, identified as a teacher, a mystic, and a minister on the back cover of the book, has had her share of working with the dying and the bereaved. In addition she has had several tragedies in her own life, including the terrible accidental death of her daughter and granddaughter just prior to the completion of the manuscript. It is when the author speaks of her experience with the counseling of people or expresses her own grief that she shows herself to be a very sensitive and commonsense counselor. In so many ways it is a shame that this gets lost in her eclectic (certainly not Christian) "new age" mysticism.

In a rather conversational style that continues through the entire book, chapter one begins with the notion that death is something we will all experience and that our fear of it is based on the unknown. It is here that the author expresses the intention of her book, which is to help people with their fear of death and explain to them that death is part of life. The second chapter argues that death is in fact a rebirth to another sort of life. It is in chapter three that Ms. Parrish-Harra applies some of her common sense and experience with some material that may be quite helpful. "My experience has taught me that most well-meaning friends and counselors tend to get the cart before the horse. Generally, they intellectualize the situation and give lots of theory, rather than taking the simple initial step: begin by just caring" (p. 13).

Chapters four and five are a paraphrase of Kübler-Ross's stage theory of dying. It is here that the author gives us some content to her injunction to care. Chapter six addresses the special problems of sudden death as opposed to expected death. Chapter seven is a list of do's and don'ts for those attempting to help the bereaved. Such advice as financial planning during health and not changing life styles during bereavement are sound ones. Chapter eight deals with depression and illness as special problems of bereavement related to stress.

Chapter nine deals with suicide. Here the author counsels us to consider the pain that a person must suffer prior to making a decision to commit the act of suicide. She hopes that having some empathetic reaction to this pain

will help most of us have more compassion for the victim as well as for those left behind who may have feelings of guilt for not having done something more to prevent the act itself. Chapter ten discusses the equally difficult problem of the death of children. Here the author recommends the national support group *Compassionate Friends*.

Chapter eleven deals with the death of pets and attempts to make the case that experiencing the death of a loved pet can be instructive to children and adults as they relate it to the death of humans. Chapter thirteen discusses the author's mysticism concerning the relationship of the dead with the living, while the next two chapters counsel the bereaved to develop the inner self to continue the task of living. Chapter sixteen, for some reason, returns to the care of the dying and stresses the need for physical touch between the healthy and the dying. Chapter seventeen returns to the problems of the bereaved and encourages them to seek the support of professional counseling, as well as community support groups, to help in the grieving process. This chapter also endorses the hospice movement. Chapter eighteen offers suggestions for memorial or "celebration of life" services for those who do not belong or are hostile to organized religion (really, I suspect, the intended readership of this book). The last chapter is but a restatement of the major theme of the book: "life and living includes death." The epilogue describes the author's own feelings after the death of her daughter and granddaughter. She includes copies of the newspaper stories describing the tragedy.

While this is a book with some sound advice about dealing with grief and with life after the death of a loved one, it is not a book with particular substance on a theological plane. While this book is sensitively presented out of real experience, most helpful material is found in pastoral experience and in the many quite helpful texts (both in a theological sense and in a psychological sense) recommended in most seminary courses over the past several years.

BRIAN H. CHILDS

Halvorson, Arndt L. *Authentic Preaching*. Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1982. Pp. 188. \$7.95 (paper).

This book begins with a challenge to all preachers. Halvorson endorses the commonly accepted view that "preachers are born, not

made," but he will not let this endorsement become a license for laziness. He writes, "A gift shrivels if it isn't worked at. . . . Many people, for instance, are artistic; they have a gift. Few are artists, people who have paid the price, suffered through the loneliness and boredom of working to develop the gift. Any Christian can preach a sermon. Preachers, however, are those who have worked hard and long at developing the skills . . ." (pp. 9-10).

The challenge comes from an experienced preacher and teacher of preachers. Halvorson is professor of homiletics at Luther-Northwestern Seminary in St. Paul. In this book he advises preachers about some of the skills that need to be sharpened if their gift is to be kept from shriveling.

Before turning to skills, however, Halvorson starts with the preacher. He argues that congregations respond primarily to the preacher, and only secondarily to the preacher's sermon. His evidence is anecdotal, but there are other studies which support this claim. On that basis, then, Halvorson says that all the skills in the world will not make a good preacher unless the preacher is perceived by the hearers to be an authentic person. That may sound like pop psychology, but Halvorson has something more in mind. The authenticity of the preacher comes from living life "under the spell of . . . the message of God's saving work in Christ." He gives brief advice on how this kind of life can be developed.

Halvorson then turns to the sermon and the skills that build it. The purpose of preaching is "to undermine the prevailing value and belief systems and to supply another." The belief system which is to be supplied comes from scripture: "A sermon is *informed* by the Bible message in its fullness, but a sermon is *created* by a text in its particularity." The shift in value systems is produced not so much by new arguments and information as it is by new insights. The preacher is to lead the hearers to see their lives in a new way. Therefore the purpose of the sermon is not to prove, but to evoke.

In a chapter entitled "Our Hidden Resources," Halvorson writes of the preacher's need to read, to read anything and everything, but especially newspapers and novels, in order to keep finding new understandings of the human situation and new words to evoke those insights which preaching seeks to produce.

Halvorson goes on to charge that contemporary preaching does not give sufficient attention to theological issues. In good Lutheran

fashion, he suggests that the dialectics of law and gospel, justification and sanctification, and God's will and human response should be at the heart of preaching. Other doctrines, he says, naturally cluster around these, which deal "at first hand with the stuff of daily existence."

Halvorson is right in saying that preachers need constantly to be honing their skills. Unfortunately, his book is not very successful in helping them. To be sure, Halvorson gives a lot of good advice about preaching. Most of it, however, has already appeared in other, and better, books.

This book suffers from several weaknesses. First, many major claims are simply asserted without supporting evidence. To write, as Halvorson does, "We are all constructed with a belief system, which creates a value system, which results in a need system," presupposes a great deal about theological anthropology and psychology of religion, but no documentation is given. To go on to argue that those belief systems are changed not by argumentation but by evoking new insights should also require some documentation, but again Halvorson gives none. There is not a footnote in the book, and many are needed.

Second, the book is poorly organized. For example, Halvorson evaluates the strengths and weaknesses of topical sermons on page 95; he does not tell us what a topical sermon is until page 184. Throughout the book, many significant issues (e.g., the alleged lack of power of religious symbols and the propriety of preaching on political issues) are introduced, then quickly abandoned without adequate discussion.

Third, there is a gap between theory and practice in this book. Many of the things Halvorson says about preaching give evidence of acquaintance with recent developments in such fields as hermeneutics and communication theory. That acquaintance is not readily apparent, however, when he gets down to telling how to put a sermon together. The sermon outlines he gives, and the one sermon printed in full, seem very traditional. They could easily have been written twenty or thirty years ago. I sympathize with Halvorson. It is easier to come up with good theories about preaching than it is to do good preaching which reflects those theories. But if we homiletics can't do it, how can we expect other preachers to do so?

This is not a bad book; it is just that there are a number of other recent books about preaching which are better. I agree with much

of what Halvorson has to say. I highly recommend his chapter on the value of reading novels. Still, nearly everything else of value in this book has been said better elsewhere. Preachers who want to develop their skills, as Halvorson challenges them to do, are likely to find other books more helpful.

WILLIAM D. HOWDEN
Princeton Theological Seminary

Wardlaw, Don M., ed. *Preaching Biblically*. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1983. Pp. 173. \$10.95 (paper).

On seeing the title, one is inclined to ask, "Is this book really necessary?" The answer, surprisingly, is "Yes."

There is good reason to ask the question. After all, in the last few years religious publishers have already given us another *Preaching Biblically* (by Thompson), not to mention *Biblical Preaching*, by Robinson, *The Bible in the Pulpit*, by Keck, and a host of other books and articles on the relationship of scripture and sermon. Do we need one more covering the same territory? No; but Wardlaw's book is different. It is different both in content, and, just as important, in format.

In his introduction, Wardlaw, professor of preaching and worship at McCormick Theological Seminary, sets the stage for what is to follow. He argues that the ideals of discursive rhetoric have dominated preaching throughout most of Christian history: "Preaching, per se, has meant marshaling an argument in logical sequence, coordinating and subordinating points by the canons of logic, all in a careful appeal to the reasonable hearer." Wardlaw rejects this ideal. Influenced by recent hermeneutical discussions, he argues that sermons should reflect the variety of literary forms found in scripture. The traditional "sermon as argument," he says, breaks up the unity of form and content found in scripture, stifles the preacher's creativity, and fails to move the hearers at the emotional and imaginative levels.

The alternative presented here is to allow the shape of the text to govern the shape of the sermon. Wardlaw enlists six other preachers and homileticians (from four Protestant denominations) to help him develop this alternative. As Ronald J. Allen, one of the contributors, puts it,

author—or community—in which it was born. To follow that form in preaching is to communicate the text in the fullness of both its cognitive (discursive, rational) and intuitive (tacit, feeling) dimensions of meaning. To change the form of preaching to a form not clearly representative of the text is akin to covering the cathedral at Chartres with vinyl siding.

There is nothing terribly new in that position. Such arguments have been made for the past several years. What is unusual about this book is the excellent way it sets out to accomplish its task. The format of all the chapters is the same. First comes a section on Forming the Sermon, in which the author presents the theoretical position from which he operates in preaching. The second section is an exegetical study of a particular passage. The third section is a sermon based on that passage. It is the third section which sets this book apart from the crowd. Not only is the sermon itself presented, but each preacher also provides interlinear comments explaining why the sermon is structured as it is, comments based on the preceding theoretical and exegetical sections.

Why has this not been done before? Why have sermon texts and homiletical theory always been kept separate? Until a few years ago most books of homiletical theory did not even contain any sample sermons. Most books of sermons did not contain a hint of theory. Only in the last decade has it become common to find several sermons added as an appendix to a book of homiletical theory, but even then, the theory and the sermons are kept in separate compartments. Wardlaw and company tear down the long-standing partition, and for once we get to hear preachers explain how their theory affects a particular sermon. One can only hope that this is the beginning of a trend.

Not only do we see how a particular theoretical approach shapes a sermon; in this book we also are introduced to some exciting theories. Each contributor looks at the task of creating sermons in the shape of scripture from a different angle. In turn, they show us how sermons can be shaped by the language of the text (Allen), by the context of the text (Wardlaw), by plotting the text's claim upon us (Thomas G. Long [PTS's new professor of preaching and worship]), by the interplay of text and metaphor (Charles Rice), by the structure of the text (William J. Carl III), by the shape of text and preacher (Gardner Taylor),

and by the encounter of text and preacher (Thomas H. Troeger).

If it sounds like there is some overlap between the chapters, there is. If it sounds like some chapters will be more helpful than others, that is true. If it sounds like some of the theoretical positions would need to be treated at greater length than the space allowed in this book, that is also true. Nevertheless, this little book is a jewel, and each of its facets reveals something significant about the task of preaching. All seven of the sermons are good, and the interlinear comments help the reader to see why they are good, to see how they work. The theoretical sections are challenging and exciting, even if somewhat underdeveloped. It

is encouraging to see that some of the best chapters are written by some of the younger generation of American homileticsians (Allen, Long, and Troeger). Wardlaw has given us a stimulating book in and of itself. The book is even more exciting if it can be seen as a portent of things to come, both in content and in format.

Is this book really necessary? Well, not quite necessary, but certainly very helpful for the preacher who wants his or her sermons to be lively, faithful proclamations of the gospel which comes to us in scripture.

WILLIAM D. HOWDEN
Princeton Theological Seminary

Theology Today

THEOLOGY TODAY presents complex issues in a way that communicates effectively, without glossing controversy. The lucidity and consistent quality of the discussions make THEOLOGY TODAY an essential component of my reading.

—Katharine D. Sakenfeld

I read every issue of THEOLOGY TODAY and have done so for a good many years. The astonishing thing is that it is still one of the most interesting journals I see.

—Karl Menninger

THEOLOGY TODAY is essential reading for all who are interested in serious and timely theological discussion. It is for me a necessity to my continuing theological education.

—Richard J. Mouw

Now in its 41st year, THEOLOGY TODAY has become the most influential and widely circulated quarterly of theology in the United States. Its articles have not only charted the trends of contemporary religious thought but influenced them as well. THEOLOGY TODAY offers its readers clear, concise essays by prominent writers and a broadened vision of the task of theology and the church in a changing world.

For a challenging look at what theology is and can be, subscribe now to THEOLOGY TODAY for \$14.00 per year.

THEOLOGY TODAY, P.O. Box 29, Princeton, NJ 08542

Please enter/renew my subscription for:

_____ 1 year (4 issues, \$14.00)

_____ Bill me

_____ 2 years (8 issues, \$25.00)

_____ Check enclosed

Name

Street

City

State Zip

Special Student rate: \$10.00 per year. Please make all checks payable to THEOLOGY TODAY in U.S. funds.

**Selected
Continuing
Education
Seminars
from
Princeton
Theological
Seminary**

**October
1984 —
January
1985**

OCTOBER 8-10

**Routes to God for Today: Nature,
Scripture, Experience**

Diogenes Allen, Princeton Seminary

OCTOBER 15-18

Fresh Every Sunday

*John R. Killinger, First Presbyterian
Church, Lynchburg, VA*

OCTOBER 22-25

**Liturgical Renewal in
Reformed Worship**

*Fred R. Anderson, Pine Street
Presbyterian Church, Harrisburg, PA;
David A. Weadon, Princeton Seminary*

NOVEMBER 7-8

The Generation of Ecumenism

*Thomas Stransky, Karlfried Froeblich,
John Long, David Willis, John C. Reiss,
James I. McCord*

NOVEMBER 26-29

The Pastor as Evangelist

*Richard S. Armstrong,
Princeton Seminary*

OFF-CAMPUS

MINNEAPOLIS - NOVEMBER 13-16

**New Testament Perspectives
on Christian Life Amidst
Suffering and Hope**

J. Christiaan Beker, Princeton Seminary
-and-

**Building a Pastoral Network in the
Local Congregation**

*Suzanne P.M. Rudiselle,
Princeton Seminary*

AFRICA - JANUARY 7-26

**Christianity in Africa —
a travel seminar**

*Robert A. Evans, Plowshares Institute;
Ronald C. White, Jr., Princeton Seminary*

**FOR MORE
INFORMATION**



Please send a brochure and application to:

Name _____

Address _____

City _____ State _____

Country _____ Zip _____

Send to: Center of Continuing Education,
Princeton Theological Seminary,
12 Library Place, Princeton, NJ 08540

PB

PRINCETON THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
CN 821

PRINCETON, NEW JERSEY 08542

Non-Profit Org.
U.S. Postage Paid
Princeton, N.J. 08542
Permit No. 190

PRINCETON THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
SPEER LIBRARY
CN 821
PRINCETON, New Jersey 08540